

Stanley Burton Covert,
 Clarence William Johnson,
 Harold Francis Hale,
 Edward Clarence Holden, Jr.,
 Loyd William Brown,
 George Stephen Curtis,
 Andrew Mack Parks,
 Oscar Allred,
 George Foster Freeman,
 Andrew Milton Harvey,
 Julian Elnathan Tobey,
 Ernest Rodger Zabriskie,
 Edward Arthur Condy,
 Raymond William Fuchs,
 Standly Hodges Southwell,
 Fred Peter Gerhardt,
 Edwin Lee Gasaway,
 Harold De Witt Hoffman,
 Burt William Harvey,
 James Frank Keller Wilcox,
 John Lewis Mickle,
 Clarence Leroy Nicholson,
 Joseph Tasse Collins, and
 Stanley Walter Curtis.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

Vivian Sadler, Cheyenne Wells.
 Dwight Cline, La Salle.
 Edward M. Robinson, Wray.

DELAWARE.

James J. English, Wilmington.

INDIANA.

Nathan W. Ringo, Dugger.
 Earle A. Smith, Gosport.
 Fred H. Foster, Oxford.

MISSOURI.

Charles B. Neville, Lawson.

NEBRASKA.

Joseph Fenimore, Merna.

OKLAHOMA.

Baker B. Woodward, Bokoshe.
 Hattie E. Malloy, Laverne.
 James G. Sprouse, McCurtain.
 Irving O. Diggs, Stillwater.
 Walter A. Thompson, Tahlequah.
 Vernon B. Ellington, Wagoner.
 Claud Hannon, Wirt.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Claud I. Force, Clear Lake.

TENNESSEE.

Jessie R. Alexander, Mountpleasant.
 Arch W. Ashton, Hohenwald.
 Benjamin W. Scott, Bradford.
 Robert L. Long, Church Hill.
 Dudley D. Edgemon, Englewood.
 Franklin W. Latta, Dyersburg.
 Enos O. Thomas, Camden.
 William H. Howard, Milan.
 Lucille Morris, Tiptonville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 27, 1919.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, help us to do Thy will this day. If we are in darkness, give us light. If we are weak, make us strong. If we wander from the paths of rectitude and duty, call us back; that we may be the instruments, in Thy hands, for the promotion of Thy kingdom upon the earth. In Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 25, and of Sunday, January 26, 1919, was read and approved.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report (No. 989) the second deficiency bill, for printing under the rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky reports a deficiency bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15140) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER. The bill is ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the life and public services of the late Gen. Joseph S. Smith, of my State, to-day buried at Arlington, with military honors.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the life and public services of the late Gen. Joseph S. Smith. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman if the late Joseph S. Smith was a former Member of this body?

Mr. HERSEY. He was not. He has been the general manager since the late Civil War of two soldiers' homes of this Nation, and he had distinguished military service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print a letter from an old soldier, consisting of 20 lines, from the Battle Mountain Sanitarium.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter of 20 lines from an old soldier at the Battle Mountain Sanitarium. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The following is the letter referred to:

NATIONAL HOME FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS,
 BATTLE MOUNTAIN SANITARIUM,
 Hot Springs, S. Dak., January 23, 1919.

From: The Battle Mountain boys.

To: Gen. I. R. SHERWOOD, M. C., Washington, D. C.

Subject: Gratitude.

MY DEAR FRIEND AND NEIGHBOR: I desire on my own account and in behalf of 300 members of Battle Mountain Sanitarium to express our heartfelt gratitude for your success with others in blocking the Gandy bill.

Wish you could have seen the joy expressed by the boys to-day when the Omaha Bee came, with an account of the defeat of the bill, with the names of all who were active in blocking it, and your name was mentioned as one. This did me much good, as I told the boys that I was sure that you would be there in our interest when the time came. So many who are here have tried to live in other places, but on account of this climate they return and say there is no other place that agrees with them, and the treatment does them the good that they get here. And for this and other reasons I am asked to write you in behalf of all the boys and thank you for this and the many good things that you have done for us boys.

We all join in wishing you health and years of active life.

Very truly, yours,

THREE HUNDRED MEMBERS OF R. M. S.,
 By SOL. FARBAUGH.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have read a very short letter from the Pension Commissioner, and desire to make a request concerning the same.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the letter will be read.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. GARD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will see the substance of it I do not think he will object.

The SPEAKER. It is not a question for debate. The gentleman asked that a letter be read, and he put the motion that it be read.

Mr. WALSH. The Chair said that without objection the letter would be read.

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair meant. Is there anybody objecting?

Mr. WALSH. I reserved the right to object and asked the topic on which the letter was written.

Mr. BLANTON. Several days ago—

Mr. WALSH. I would like to know what the letter is.

Mr. BLANTON. Several days ago I had printed in the RECORD a report of a special committee of the Pension Bureau concerning the act of March 4, 1917, which showed—

Mr. WALSH. The letter is about a pension law?

Mr. BLANTON. Indian pensions. It showed the parties in certain commands who were entitled to pensions and those who were not. The commissioner has written a letter stating he would like to have 100 copies of that document for answering inquiries in case it should be printed as a House document. I wanted that letter read as a basis for the request that it be printed as a House document.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, January 25, 1919.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: I was much pleased to read in the RECORD of January 20, 1919, your remarks concerning the act of March 4, 1917, granting pensions to certain Texas volunteers, etc.

If it be published in pamphlet form, we would like very much to have at least 100 copies in the Pension Bureau that we may use it in answering inquiries. Thank you very much.

Very truly, yours,

G. M. SALTZGABER,
Commissioner.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this report as printed in the RECORD several days ago be printed as a House document with this letter of the commissioner as a preface to it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not read the matter which the gentleman had inserted in the RECORD, I am sorry to say, but, as I understand, it was an official ruling of the Pension Bureau.

Mr. BLANTON. The commissioner appointed a special committee of five experts in his department to pass upon the old muster rolls of Texas and other ancient documents there bearing upon the act of March 4, 1917, in order that it might be determined which commands of the various ones there that engaged in Indian fighting, and so forth, were entitled to benefits under this act and which were not. A great number of applications have been filed in the Pension Bureau for pensions under this act, and many of the applicants are not entitled to pensions.

Mr. WALSH. I think they have a mimeograph machine down at the Pension Bureau. I object.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. Did my colleague, Gen. SHERWOOD, ask that his letter be read or merely incorporated?

The SPEAKER. He asked that it be printed in the RECORD.

HOSPITAL AND SANATORIUM FACILITIES FOR SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary, I think, under the rule to move to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13026. Does not the House resolve itself automatically into committee?

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13026, with Mr. HARDY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13026, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13026) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged soldiers and sailors.

The CHAIRMAN. There are remaining 10 minutes to the proponents of the bill and 32 minutes to the opponents.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I understand there was some arrangement by which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT] would transfer five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN]. Will he do that now?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes. I will transfer five minutes from this side to the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. Making 15 minutes in the control of the gentleman from Florida and 27 minutes in the control of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Indiana will use some of his time, I shall be glad.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think there is no Member of the House who is not willing that our returning soldiers should receive all the care, all the attention, and all the consideration and hospital treatment which can be given to them. But the bill before us, in my judgment, should not be passed, for the very good reason that the Government now owns and controls a sufficient number of hospitals to take care of all the soldiers that we are likely to be called upon to take care of.

I think it is clearly understood, and yet it might be necessary to say, that the bill provides for hospitals to be operated under the Public Health Service, and under the provisions of the bill

the hospitals which the bill provides for are not intended for the soldiers who return from the front. It is intended, as Dr. Banks, who is the Chief of the Bureau of Public Health Service, said, for the patients of the War Risk Insurance Bureau. These patients, in the main, although there are a few others, are those who have never been sent overseas. In fact, they have never been mustered into the Army. They are rather those who have passed the local board of examiners and have been brought to the various cantonments and Army posts and have been rejected and returned to their homes as being physically unfit for military duty. So that we want to have clearly before us a correct understanding of the proposition.

Now, we may as well be frank in order to have a clear understanding that the hospitals which this bill provides for will be administered under the Treasury Department, and the hospitals we now have, of which we have an abundant supply, are being operated under the War Department. It seems to me that here there is a conflict of authority.

I do not want to make statements based on my opinion, rather on the evidence submitted at the hearing.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KREIDER. In a moment. I shall try and make no statement that is not borne out by the hearings before the committee. Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAPES. How does the Bureau of War Risk Insurance get jurisdiction over the men who are not mustered into the service?

Mr. KREIDER. By the provisions of the conscription act which we passed. It is contended that when we selected men from private walks of life and compelled them to appear before our local boards, where they were examined by physicians appointed by the Government and pronounced to be physically fit or sound and sent to the cantonments and thence returned because of being physically unfit, the law presumes that they were physically fit when they were passed by the local boards, and therefore they become beneficiaries under the selective-service law.

Mr. MAPES. That is the provision in the war-risk insurance act?

Mr. KREIDER. That is the provision now.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KREIDER. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. Is not the gentleman slightly mistaken? Does not that law provide that they shall have been passed and shall have gone into the service of the Government, and then so-and-so?

Mr. KREIDER. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and I desire to refresh his memory and call his attention to the hearings. There he will find that in the hearings, No. 14, page 31, the fact I referred to is brought out very clearly.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. KREIDER. Yes; for a question.

Mr. DYER. I do not want to ask the gentleman a question except in this way: This is a bill which, I understand, involves an expenditure of \$10,000,000?

Mr. KREIDER. Yes; \$10,500,000.

Mr. DYER. Reported under the rule?

Mr. KREIDER. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Probably not one-fourth of the membership of the House knows anything about it.

Mr. KREIDER. I think that is true.

Mr. DYER. And we have present here 15 or 20 Members. If the gentleman will pardon me, I will make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of no quorum. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Caldwell	Decker	Eagan
Austin	Carew	Delaney	Edmonds
Bacharach	Carter, Mass.	Dempsey	Emerson
Bell	Chandler, N. Y.	Denison	Esch
Benson	Cleary	Dent	Estopinal
Black	Connally, Tex.	Dewalt	Fairchild, G. W.
Blackmon	Cooper, Ohio	Dies	Fields
Boomer	Cooper, Wis.	Dill	Flynn
Borland	Copley	Dixon	Fordney
Britten	Costello	Donovan	Francis
Browne	Cox	Dooling	Freeman
Browning	Crago	Doremus	Fuller, Mass.
Brumbaugh	Curry, Cal.	Drane	Gallivan
Butler	Davey	Drukker	Good
Byrns, Tenn.	Davis	Dunn	Goodall

Goodwin, Ark.	Lea, Cal.	Price	Stephens, Neb.
Gordon	Leshner	Rainey, H. T.	Sterling
Graham, Pa.	Linthicum	Riordan	Strong
Gray, N. J.	Lobeck	Robbins	Sullivan
Greene, Vt.	London	Roberts	Swift
Gregg	McAndrews	Rowe	Tague
Griest	McKenzie	Rowland	Taylor, Ark.
Hamill	McLaughlin, Pa.	Rubey	Templeton
Hamilton, N. Y.	Maher	Russell	Thomas
Hamlin	Mansfield	Sabath	Tinkham
Haskell	Mason	Sanders, La.	Vare
Hawley	Mondell	Sanford	Venable
Hayes	Moore, Pa.	Scully	Voigt
Heaton	Morin	Sears	Waldow
Heintz	Mott	Shackleford	Wason
Helm	Mudd	Shallenberger	Watson, Pa.
Helvering	Neely	Sherley	Watson, Va.
Houston	Nelson, J. M.	Siegel	Welty
Husted	Nichols, Mich.	Sims	Whaley
Hutchinson	Nolan	Sinnott	White, Ohio
Johnson, S. Dak.	Norton	Slemp	Wilson, Ill.
Kahn	Park, N. Y.	Small	Winslow
Kelley, Mich.	Parker, N. Y.	Smith, Mich.	Wise
Kennedy, R. I.	Platt	Smith, C. R.	Wood, Ind.
Key, Ohio	Pou	Smith, T. F.	Woods, Iowa
Kitchin	Powers	Snyder	
Larsen	Pratt	Steenerson	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARDY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13026) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers and sailors, found itself without a quorum, whereupon he caused the roll to be called, when 264 Members, a quorum, answered to their names, and he presented the names of the absentees to be printed in the Journal and RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its session.

Accordingly the committee resumed its session, with Mr. HARDY in the chair.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of those Members who were not here before the roll call, I will state that I tried to explain who were the beneficiaries of the War Risk Insurance Bureau, and in reply to the question of the gentleman from Missouri I will direct his attention to the hearings, No. 14, page 31, where the following statement is made by Dr. Charles E. Banks, chief medical officer for the War Risk Insurance Bureau:

Dr. BANKS. The original bill provided for that contingency, but Congress amended the act some time in July, by which, under the language of the law, "the above-named officer, commissioned officer, or enlisted man shall have been held to have been in sound condition when inducted into the service." Now, The Adjutant General holds that a man is inducted into the service the moment he is passed by the draft board. Consequently, everybody—good, bad, and indifferent—is eligible for the benefits of the war-risk insurance provisions who comes into the Army from the draft board.

I could go on and read further, but I think that answers the question as to who are the beneficiaries, in the opinion of Dr. Charles E. Banks.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KREIDER. I prefer not to be interrupted until I finish my statement. I am quoting from the hearings, which the gentleman can refute, or the accuracy of the statements contained in which he can question, if he desires.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want to direct the attention of the gentleman to the law, section 300.

Mr. KREIDER. If the gentleman will give me time, he can direct my attention to the hearings, the law, or anything else he sees fit. But, as my time is limited, I also wish to call attention to the question as to who these hospitals are for. At the same hearing the chairman of the committee asked the question as to whom these hospitals are for. And the direct reply was that they are for the patients of the War Risk Insurance Bureau. Read page 34 of the hearings.

The reason I am dwelling on that is to show that these hospitals are not intended to be built for the benefit of the returning soldier who has seen actual service, but that they are intended for those who have become beneficiaries of the War Risk Insurance Bureau through the method which I have tried to explain. It is perhaps needless to say, because I think the majority of the Members know, that during the summer of 1918 the War Department made great preparations in the way of building hospitals in order to take care of the number of wounded whom they believed they would be called upon to take care of. At that time they had supposed that the war would probably continue during 1919; but when the armistice was signed, on the 11th of November, they immediately canceled a large number of the contracts for the building of hospitals on which they had entered, knowing that when those hospitals which were under construction were completed they would have enough and more hospital capacity than they could possibly use.

Statements have been made as to the number of beds available and the number of beds occupied. These statements have been inserted in the RECORD and in the minority report. They have not been brought up exactly to date. This morning before I came on the floor of the House I called up the Surgeon General's Department and asked how many vacant beds there are now, and they told me about 45,000. I said, "How many more beds are about to be completed, not included in the 45,000?" And they told me about 15,000; so that there will be approximately 60,000 vacant beds. This is largely in excess of what they hope they will ever be called upon to use, and they stand ready now, as they have stood ready, to turn over hospitals, which it may be conceded are not the most desirable, but, nevertheless, they are hospitals that are suitable for the purpose, and have been used for the purpose, and are now owned by the Government of the United States and are fully equipped. The department is ready not only to turn over several of these hospitals now but possibly half a dozen more within from three to six months.

The number of wounded has been given as approximately 190,000, of whom approximately 60,000 have been brought to this country. Now, I have no intention to say anything that is not absolutely fair, but I want to direct your attention to the fact that when we speak of these 190,000 wounded we speak of all those who have been sent to the hospitals. I asked the department about the average length of time that is required for a wounded soldier to remain in a hospital until he is discharged. The statistics show that 80 per cent of those who are wounded return to the front within six weeks. Now, that includes the slightly wounded. The department, of course, has no official record, but it was stated to me that if you eliminate the tuberculosis patients and the insane the average stay of the wounded soldier in the hospital is probably about six weeks. Your attention has been directed to 120,000 wounded soldiers. Possibly out of those 120,000 over 60 per cent have been returned to the front and to their commands and are not now patients in any overseas hospital. At any rate, this last report that the Surgeon General's Department has is that there are approximately 104,000 patients now in hospitals on the other side, over 50 per cent of whom are not wounded but are sick, who will probably be returned to their commands. They are no doubt coming in and going out all the time, and they are not the men who will be sent over to this side. During the month of December there were returned about 23,000 soldiers who required hospital attention. It is assumed that during the next two months, before the 1st of April, every soldier will be returned who needs hospital attention. Now, that being the case, I might say here also that the average length of time that a tuberculosis patient remains in the hospital is six months, as testified in the hearings. Now, let us consider what is the project before us. We are considering building hospitals for patients whom we now have, but whom we will not have in 6 months or a year or 18 months or 2 years from now, the very earliest that any of these hospitals can be completed. Now here is the proposition before us: Are we going to authorize the building of hospitals and the spending of tens of millions of dollars to accommodate patients who will not exist when those hospitals are completed? We all want to do everything we can for the returned soldiers, but the Government of the United States now owns a sufficient number of hospitals to take care of the patients. Furthermore, as has been stated, the officials of the War Department and of the Navy Department have both gone on record over their signatures saying they will not discharge any soldier who requires hospital treatment. They have ample facilities for taking care of them themselves, and they do not purpose to turn these men over to the Public Health Service. This is not a political matter. In my humble judgment I do not see why we should now build more hospitals. I have not time to refer to the report of the American Hospital Association. This is the highest medical authority in the United States. They have gone on record and in a circular describing the treatment and the best treatment for our tuberculous patients. They are not advocating the building of large hospitals and segregating them in those hospitals, but prefer treating the men nearer their homes. I have no time to go into the nature of the disease. I think it is generally known that tuberculous patients usually prefer to keep in close proximity to their own homes.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KREIDER. I will.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman said that they will not discharge any soldier who requires hospital treatment. I did not catch the name of the authority that he quoted from.

Mr. KREIDER. The officials of the Navy Department and of the War Department have stated that they will not discharge soldiers or sailors so long as they require hospital treatment.

Mr. KEARNS. If a soldier thought he could get better attention at home than he could in the Army, would they not discharge him?

Mr. KREIDER. That is not pertinent to this bill, because this bill provides for hospitals to be used for the War Risk Bureau patients.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I confess that in the beginning I approached this question with many misgivings. At first I had views very similar to those expressed by gentlemen here who have spoken in opposition to the bill. The hearings will show that I asked questions which committed me to that viewpoint. But the more I studied it the more I became convinced I was in error. The one fact that stares our country in the face to-day is that we are just emerging from the greatest war that the world has ever known.

Unfortunately a large number of America's best and bravest boys have been wounded. These wounded soldiers must be cared for. Gentlemen say that we have by law pledged care, hospital treatment, and medical aid to the soldiers. Waive that, if you please. Consider that there is not one word of law in existence to-day obligating Congress to take care of and treat the boys after they return, the fact yet remains that there is an obligation on us greater and more binding than mere law can make it. It is an obligation springing from reciprocal duty. These boys fought for our preservation and for the preservation of liberty in this great Republic and in the world, and we must take care of them, not solely because we promised to do it but because in itself it is right to do it. [Applause.]

Gentlemen argue that among the various activities of the Public Health Service it would use the hospitals here provided for in caring for and administering to the needs of men who did not fight on the firing line in France; and the gentleman who has just taken his seat, my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER], for whom I have a great deal of respect and personal affection, says that the hospitals will be filled with boys passed by the legal draft board but who never entered the service except in that formal way. The gentleman quotes from page 34 of the hearings, in which an eminent surgeon testified—and a splendid surgeon he is, too, but he is not much of a lawyer, because in his testimony before the committee he so misquoted or misstated the law as to mislead the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER]. Quoting from testimony of this surgeon, the gentleman read as follows:

The above-named officer, commissioned officer, or enlisted man shall have been held to have been in sound condition when inducted into the service.

That is not the law, and if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] ever becomes interested in legal questions in a vital way I will suggest to him to consult a lawyer and not a doctor. Let me read the law:

That for death or disability resulting from personal injury suffered or disease contracted in the line of duty by any commissioned officer or enlisted man or by any member of the Army Nurse Corps (female) or of the Navy Nurse Corps (female) when employed in the active service under the War Department or Navy Department, the United States shall pay compensation as hereinafter provided; but no compensation shall be paid if the injury or disease has been caused by his own willful misconduct: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this section said officer, enlisted man, or other member shall be held and taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service: *Provided further*, That this section as amended shall be deemed to become effective as of October 6, 1917.

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. KREIDER. Does the gentleman know, as a matter of fact, what the status of these men is? What was their status in the service?

Mr. RUCKER. For many purposes after he passed the draft board he became a soldier and was in the service, necessarily so.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Under the law.

Mr. RUCKER. Under the law. He was amenable to punishment for desertion or any military offense. But for the purposes of this law Congress had the foresight and wisdom to say that for the purposes of this law—that is, the law providing for compensation—a man shall be considered in sound condition after he shall have been examined, accepted, and enrolled for service. When accepted—by whom? By the medical authorities at the camp and enrolled into the service of his country, and not until then. I can not discuss that any longer, but let me say that I for one will join hands with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] if the law we passed is as absurd as the doctor said it was, and as the gentleman argued it is by his remarks, and assist him to amend it. Who wants to build hospitals for

men who were afflicted with disease, mental or physical, at the time of passing the draft board and who for those reasons were unfit for military service, and therefore were sent back to their homes without being accepted and enrolled for service? Who wants to build hospitals for them? Nobody. On the other hand, when the boys are taken from their homes, from their fathers and mothers, from their wives and children, and put into the camps, accepted by the military authorities, enrolled for duty, and subsequently were discharged because of infirmities and afflictions of service origin, then our duty arises and we should act. It ill behooves any man here to question the right or wisdom of making provision for such men.

I sincerely hope this bill will pass, as it ought to pass. Let us give relief to these boys who are coming back maimed, wounded, and impaired in health.

By unanimous consent, Mr. RUCKER was granted leave to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time we have upon this side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 10 minutes and the other side has 10 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I have reserved those 10 minutes for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], chairman of the committee, and I will ask the other side to use their time now.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call to the attention of the committee what I understand to be the intent of this bill. First, I understand it to be to secure a \$10,000,000 appropriation for the purpose of providing hospital treatment for those who were sent to the Army camps and who, after examination in the Army camps by the medical officers, were returned as unfit for service. In other words, Mr. Chairman, only those men who through negligence or inattention or oversight of the draft board were sent to these camps and whom the officers in the camp found were not fit for military service, because of disabilities, are to be cared for by this bill. This bill is intended to take care of that one class.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. I can not yield until I have made my statement. Mr. Chairman, if there is a considerable number of men in this country who were drafted into the service and found unfit for service in a few weeks after they got to the camps by the medical officers, then there is every opportunity in every State in this land for their treatment. There are in my State and in my city hospitals for the treatment of men afflicted with tubercular diseases or with any other trouble. That is one class. It has been stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN], who so ably presented the case on the part of the committee, that it is also provided that this bill shall affect and take care of men who were discharged from the service, who had been in the Army for some length of time, who probably contracted tuberculosis or other diseases in France or in the camps of this country. This morning I talked with the Surgeon General's office, and Col. Smith told me they have three large tubercular hospitals in this country that are not by any means filled. Not only that, but he told me this morning that the Surgeon General of the Army had to-day sent a letter to the Secretary of War asking the Secretary of War to ask Congress for authority to readmit to the hospitals of this country soldiers who have been discharged and are found afterwards to need medical treatment.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Is it not true that to-day, under the Overman bill, the President could make an order of that kind if he desired?

Mr. DYER. He could if he was here and knew the situation and condition in this country.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. No; I have only five minutes, and I trust the gentleman will not interrupt me until I have had an opportunity to make my statement. What other justification is there for this \$10,000,000 appropriation. The marine hospitals of this country do not need all their beds for the treatment of patients that they are now authorized under the law to take care of. I have in my city of St. Louis a marine hospital that to-day is not nearly filled, not over two-thirds, at the most, of its beds are filled now or have been filled for many years.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. I can not at this time.

Mr. RUCKER. Then, I will answer the gentleman in a few minutes in my own time, and I will ask the gentleman then if he wants to put the interest and welfare of the property holders of St. Louis above the boys who have been fighting.

Mr. DYER. That is not a question pertinent to what I said. The marine hospital in St. Louis, owned by the United States, has been admitting men who were in the service in this war. Men have gone there from the camps located near St. Louis, men wearing the uniform of the service, and this hospital has had room to take care of them.

Here is the proposition, pure and simple. It is a question of whether or not the men who have been wounded in fighting the battles of our country, men who have contracted this dreadful disease—tuberculosis—whether those men, men whom we see in the Walter Reed Hospital—and I wish every Member of Congress would go there and see the patients in that hospital—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to yield me a minute more in order to conclude my sentence.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. DYER. Shall receive the best treatment possible. We ought not to permit the Public Health Service to take over for treatment men who have fought the battles of this Republic. The War Department ought to do that. It ought to be under the Surgeon General of the Army, who has looked after these men since they left home, who should continue to look after these men as long as they live, whether they are in the service or have been discharged. Surg. Gen. Ireland to-day has written a letter to the Secretary of War, asking the Secretary of War to go to Congress and ask Congress for authority to readmit men to the hospitals who have been discharged for one reason or another and are in need of treatment. In the tuberculosis hospital—a general hospital—in Fort Bayard Hospital they have been admitting patients all of the time, men who have been discharged from the service. You can get a man in there who has served in the Philippines if he has tuberculosis. There is no excuse for asking for an appropriation of this kind. It is an injustice to the men who have fought the battles of this war and who have won it. The Secretary of War is responsible, through the Surgeon General. He has been given ample funds. Let us give him the authority he still needs to care for soldiers discharged.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think that every Member of this House and everybody in America wants to do everything that is necessary or proper to take care of the men who fought the battles for this country and saved us from the galling yoke of autocracy, but we must proceed in this business in an orderly manner. After more than 50 years have elapsed we are still taking care of the veterans of the Civil War, and we will have to take care of them for some years yet, although I notice in this morning's paper that one-tenth of the veterans of the Civil War who were left had died during this last year. This proposition which we have before us is not for the purpose of building hospitals to take care of soldiers who are in the Army. The Army now has enough hospitals to take care of them, but this is a proposition to take care of those men after their discharge from the Army. There will have to be a comprehensive plan adopted, gentlemen, to take care of the wounded and sick men of this war. We will have to adopt an adequate system of pensions, we will have to build adequate soldiers' homes to take care of these boys who have not homes of their own in which they can be taken care of, and that is the reason why I am objecting to this bill as it is now presented. It is simply a makeshift measure. The Public Health Service and the Bureau of War Risk Insurance do not know whether they are traveling afoot or on horseback. They come in here and ask for an appropriation of \$10,500,000 to take care of a proposition that eventually may take \$50,000,000 or \$100,000,000. Whatever it takes I am for it, but I am not for this bill, because it does not offer any comprehensive plan for taking care of these men in a way on which we can depend. I, for one, am getting tired of having men come before me and ask my vote for an appropriation of \$1,000,000, \$10,000,000, \$50,000,000, or \$100,000,000 and not give an adequate reason or give a comprehensive plan for its expenditure, one upon which we can go back to the taxpayers of this country and receive their indorsement. We are just about to engage upon a system of expenditures in this country that is going to appall the taxpayers of the country. They are willing to do everything that is necessary to take care of these boys and to do it right, but they are going to demand of this Congress, of the War Department, and of the various bureaus of this Government, that we get down to a basis of common, ordinary economy and do

these things right, so that when we spend a dollar for the benefit of these boys they are going to get the benefit of that dollar.

Now, another thing I object to is this. This matter comes down to this, the turning over to the Public Health Service in conjunction with the Bureau of War Risk Insurance of the treatment of these soldiers. I have said nothing on the floor of this House heretofore in regard to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, but I wish to say this: I have had considerable experience with this Bureau of War Risk Insurance and I want to say this to you, gentlemen, that if the Bureau of War Risk Insurance would not do any better job in taking care of these wounded and sick soldiers than they have in taking care of the allotments which the soldiers have made to their wives and dependents, God help the poor fellow who had to depend upon them for treatment. [Applause.]

Mr. GRIFFIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; I have not any time to yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I hope the gentleman will be good enough to yield to allow me to correct a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. The time was taken up by the gentleman from New York interrupting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman had expired when the gentleman from New York interrupted him.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, there has been more camouflage about this bill than any bill which I have seen before the House for a long time. Now, it is well enough after all of these attempts which have been made to becloud the issue to come right down to the point and let us see what the facts are. The facts are, Mr. Chairman, in the first place, under the law when a man is discharged from the service—a soldier or a sailor—he can not after that be treated in a hospital under the jurisdiction of the War Department. That is the law and there is no question about it. In the next place, the Bureau of War Risk Insurance under this bill, if gentlemen are so much afraid of that bureau, will not have a thing on earth to do with the treatment of these soldiers. The bill turns this over entirely to the Public Health Service and not the War Risk Bureau. Now, Mr. Chairman, we want to get down to the facts; why the necessity for this bill; and I want to read a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, for 20 years a distinguished Member of this body, and I hope gentlemen will listen to what he says. This letter was written January 16 and addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, asking for a rule to consider this bill:

JANUARY 16, 1919.

Hon. EDWARD W. POU,

Chairman Committee on Rules,

United States House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. POU: I wish to invite your attention to the very urgent need of providing additional hospital facilities for the care and treatment of patients of the Public Health Service and for discharged soldiers and sailors who are beneficiaries of the war-risk insurance, for which the Treasury Department is charged by law with the responsibility of providing hospital accommodations and treatment.

The present total normal bed capacity of hospitals under the control of this department is but 1,548, while on November 20 there were actually 1,556 patients in its hospitals. Indeed, it has been necessary for many months to crowd our hospitals to the limit of their capacity by placing additional beds in undesirable places and to refuse admission to many who are entitled to treatment in our hospitals. This department also has the names and addresses of upward of 50,000 other cases entitled under law to receive treatment, for which there are absolutely no hospital accommodations.

Now, these gentlemen want something "comprehensive." Here it is. That word seems to rest upon their tongues like a sweet morsel—"something comprehensive."

A comprehensive and carefully worked out scheme of additional hospital accommodations, much of which will be of a more permanent nature and affording a permanent groundwork for the hospitalization of persons entitled to treatment by this department, is provided for in a bill which has been given number H. R. 13026, now awaiting action by the House of Representatives.

It is reasonable to presume from the location of this bill on the House Calendar that consideration of it will not be reached for a very considerable time, possibly not this session, and as the most urgent need of these additional accommodations is for the benefit of discharged soldiers and sailors who require and are entitled to hospital treatment, it is of vital interest to every section of the Nation that the Government may be put in position to promptly carry out its contract in this respect, as expressed in the amended act of October 6, 1917, and prior legislation.

May I not suggest and urge that a special rule be brought by your committee for the immediate consideration of this bill as reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds on December 21, a copy of which is hereto attached?

Respectfully,

(Signed)

CARTER GLASS,
Secretary.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if that does not set forth the urgency of this proposition, the facts showing the absolute need of it, nothing can. But what are the facts in the hearings? Gentlemen quoted Col. Smith, of the Surgeon General's office, War Department. One gentleman says we have got all sorts of propositions that can be taken care of, and every time it is procrastination, it is delay. I want to say to you, gentlemen, that on yesterday I talked with a soldier in Walter Reed Hospital. It is crowded down there, and it is not a place where these boys ought to be, if the statements made in the public press and which he repeated to me are true; and yet we are standing around here wanting to wait six months or a year to begin work on hospitals. The sooner we begin, the earlier we will take care of these boys; and we ought to take care of them. We are under a solemn legislative contract to do it, and yet gentlemen say, "If it is not done my way, I do not propose to have it done at all."

Now, then, what are the facts? Dr. Stimpson, the Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service—on page 46, I think it is, of the hearings, or in the beginning of the first hearing—said that the Bureau of War Risk Insurance asked to place their patients in Public Health Service hospitals; that this was done and our hospitals are full. "We have not any rooms at all for more patients. The War Risk Bureau asked us to take care of 14,000 tubercular patients. We took the matter up with the Secretary of the Treasury, who asked us to see the War Department." They did, and there was a conference, of which my colleague spoke, of the three departments—the Navy, the War, and the Public Health Service—and they agreed upon the plan embodied in this bill to take care of them. In a letter from the Acting Surgeon General the War Department says:

The Army has no provision for treating the above class of patients.

And yet gentlemen say we should put them in the Army hospitals. Dr. Banks, the chief surgeon of the War Risk Bureau, said, on page 46:

Something must be done * * * because these men are being discharged now at the rate of five to the thousand for tuberculosis.

Now, what did Col. Smith say? I want to call the attention of this House to the fact, and the hearings show it, that Col. Smith was before the committee representing the Surgeon General's office of the War Department, and I put the question to him time after time:

Colonel, if the War Department has any hospitals that can be turned over to the Public Health Service, tell us about them, because we want to use them.

And every time he said, "Now we can not turn over a single bed for the use of the Public Health Service."

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have not the time.

He finally did say that he could turn over a hospital at Hot Springs, N. C., and one at some other place; "but," he said, "they are the least desirable of any that we have." And gentlemen will say that these "least desirable" hospitals are good enough for the boys who fought at Chateau-Thierry and who went into the Argonne Forest. Then what are we to understand? He said that those were the two least desirable hospitals that they have, "those that do not suit us and will not suit anybody, but we will turn them over to you, because we can not use them." And yet gentlemen say that we ought to take that kind of treatment for our brave sons who followed the Stars and Stripes.

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; I have not the time. He said this:

By the acquisition of buildings by lease and the transfer by the War Department to the Medical Department at various posts of the Army others have been acquired for general hospital purposes up to 37.

I have not time to read it all, but the hearings show that the United States Government does not own more than four general permanent hospitals in the world to-day. They have 37, but they do not own them. They are leased and they are used in one way and another. And the record from the War Department shows that they do not own but four under the shining sun of heaven anywhere to-day. However, they have leased some hotels and they have some cantonments here and there and have places like that. But Col. Smith stated before us that there were 52,000 vacant beds at that time. He was asked, "How many can you turn over to us?" "Not one, because we are saving them as a margin of safety for the soldiers, wounded and sick, coming from across the sea." And he would not give a single, solitary one to the Public Health Service. And yet, Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen say, "Put it off until a more convenient season."

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that we are under a solemn contract with these boys who have saved democracy for the peoples of the earth and saved this Government, and it is cowardly on our part and it is a violation of our contract not to take every step possible to provide every accommodation for them. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to provide immediate additional hospital and sanatorium facilities for the care and treatment of discharged sick and disabled soldiers and sailors, patients of the War Risk Insurance Bureau, and for others entitled to treatment by the Public Health Service by lease or purchase of existing plants or the construction of new hospitals and sanatoria, to include the necessary buildings, with their appropriate mechanical equipment and approach work, including roads leading thereto, for the accommodation of patients, officers, nurses, attendants, storage, laundries, and live stock, on sites now owned by the Government, or on new sites to be acquired by purchase or otherwise at such places as he may elect, including the remodeling of such of the existing or authorized buildings and their equipment, owned by the United States, as may be necessary to economically adapt such facilities to those herein provided, at the sanatorium at Fort Stanton, N. Mex., and at such of the marine hospitals where increased facilities can be placed, at a limit of cost for sites and buildings, etc., as aforesaid, complete, \$9,700,000, or as much thereof as may be found necessary; for miscellaneous furniture and equipment for the above, \$800,000; in all, \$10,500,000, and the above amounts are hereby authorized, and when appropriated to be immediately available and remain available until expended.

Mr. MANN and Mr. GANDY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman withhold it for a moment and let us dispose of a committee amendment?

Mr. MANN. I am perfectly willing to do so.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. There is a committee amendment. The gentleman withholds his amendment until we can dispose of the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 5, strike out "treatment" and insert in lieu thereof the word "treatment."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANN: Page 1, line 6, after the word "soldiers," strike out the word "and" and insert after the word "sailors" the words "and marines."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. We will accept that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I assume there is no objection to the amendment which I have offered in order to correct the language.

I have had a good deal of doubt about this bill, and I would like to discuss it for a few minutes with the Members of the House. As I understand the law, the War Department is not authorized under existing law to admit discharged soldiers into the Army hospitals. Of course, the Army is not authorized to admit discharged sailors into the Army hospitals. So that some law, it seems to me, ought to be enacted. We either ought to provide that the discharged men shall be eligible for admission into the hospitals now in existence or being created under the Army, so that they can be taken care of after their discharge in accordance with the practical pledge provided in the war-risk insurance law and in accordance with the sentiment both of Congress and the country, or else we ought to make other provisions separate and apart from the Army for taking care of the discharged soldiers.

It has been stated here that the Army was loath to discharge men now in the hospitals. I suppose other Members of Congress have had the same sort of complaints that I have had from men in the hospitals—that they could not get discharges from the hospitals and go home. I can appreciate the desire of the soldier to go home from a hospital, and also the desire of the Army to keep him in the hospital as long as it is to his advantage to stay there. Some legislation, it seems, is needed, either to provide a method by which discharged soldiers can be taken care of in the Army hospitals or out of the Army hospitals, and it will not do, it seems to me, for Congress to get into the position where it is contesting between the two propositions and then do nothing. [Applause.] It would be a disgrace to Congress if we were unable to determine which horn

of the dilemma we would take. It is our duty to do things, to enact legislation.

Now, it is suggested that the Army has sufficient hospital facilities, either in existence or in process of erection, to provide for all hospitals required. I do not know what the facts may be as to that; no one knows. The Surgeon General's office does not know, because it is finitely impossible for anybody now to tell how much disease there will be among the boys when they have come home which requires hospital facilities. But we had better go a little over the limit than to be away beneath the limit in the way of hospital facilities for the boys who are in the service.

Now, I find that gentlemen have been urging, first, that we employ the hospital facilities now in the Army. That could be done, I suppose, by a provision of law authorizing or requiring the admission of discharged soldiers. That, then, brings up first the question as to whether it is desirable as a permanent policy to say that the Army shall have control over the soldiers' homes, whether you call them homes or hospitals, of discharged soldiers and sailors. That is an old, old contest. We now have soldiers' homes throughout the country, to a large extent the same as hospitals, not under the control of the Army. The Army has the duty of inspecting the soldiers' homes, but Congress long ago, whether wisely or unwisely, determined to take away the control of the discharged Civil War soldiers from the Army. In other words, I take it that it was the opinion of Members of Congress, and probably the opinion of the country at the time, that it was not advisable to put these old soldiers, in ill health or otherwise grouchy and disgruntled in various ways and at various times, under the strict Army discipline. I suspect that they have strict enough discipline in the soldiers' homes now to gall the soldiers without putting them under the strictest kind of Army discipline. Whatever may have been the theory of Congress, however, that was done.

Now, the contest is as to whether men who have been discharged and who have to be taken care of by the Government shall be taken care of in hospitals under the control of the Army or under the control of the Public Health Service. As to the Public Health Service, I was going to say it is a grasping body, but that is true of all Government functions. It is very rare that any bureau or department of the Government does not seek to increase its authority and jurisdiction rather than decrease it. There is that contest going on. I am inclined to think, while it is not such a very positive opinion in my mind, that the soldiers will receive better care and more humane treatment and be less subject to severe and onerous martial regulations under the Public Health Service than they would be under the Army direction and under Army discipline.

I find this provision in this bill as an amendment, and I would be very glad to have information concerning it. We have had a good deal said in the House here—well said, appropriately said—about the Government having facilities already. This bill authorizes—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. This bill authorizes in its first paragraph a limit of cost of \$10,500,000 for the acquirement and equipment of these hospital facilities under the Public Health Service. That is the total limit. What it will cost in the end, of course, no one can tell, but that is all the authorization provided in this bill. Then, I read an amendment of the committee, which, so far as I know, is to be offered and voted upon:

Provided, That nothing shall be expended out of the amounts authorized by this act until all buildings, grounds, furniture, and furnishings available for hospital purposes not needed by the said departments or officers of the Government hereinbefore mentioned have been turned over to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Now, the departments mentioned are the War, Navy, Interior, and Labor Departments, and possibly others, under the control of the President, so that apparently the bill provides, first, an authorization of \$10,500,000 for hospital facilities and then makes a provision that if, however, the Government now has any hospital facilities in the Army or under the Interior Department or under the Navy Department that are not required for use in that department they shall be turned over to the Public Health Service, and no money can be spent out of the amount authorized in this bill until somebody, I take it, certifies—the different heads of departments and the President—that there is nothing further under their control not needed in that particular department which can be turned over to the Government.

Now, if the War Department has additional hospital facilities which it does not require, under the terms of this bill it is required to turn those facilities over to the Public Health Service, and the same is true of any of the other departments of the Government; so that apparently, if this amendment stays in the bill, when it becomes a law there will be no duplication of unnecessary hospital facilities. I will not say that such a duplication will not occur, because that is an executive matter, but, so far as the legislative end of it is concerned, we have provided for no additional facilities.

Now, I think I shall vote for this bill. I have not fully determined in my mind yet. But this is certain to me: We have got to do something; we have to provide hospital facilities for these boys who have come home, who have received their discharges, who have gone to their homes ill, and soon will become unable to work, and there will be more of them 10 years from now than there are now. Time will increase the number. We can not say that while we quarrel whether we shall cross a "t" or dot an "i" they shall suffer. It is up to us to provide by legislation some method by which they will receive proper attention. [Applause.]

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has covered the ground so well that it is difficult to add to what he has said. However, there has been so much said, from so many different angles, that it has been more or less confusing to know just what this bill purposes to do and what the situation is.

Now, first of all, let me recall to the Members of this House that the war-risk insurance act provides that these discharged soldiers shall receive hospital treatment. So there is a burden on somebody connected with our Government to take care of these discharged soldiers by actual enactment of law. That is in section 302, subdivision 3, of the war-risk insurance act.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman read it?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes; I will read it, if I may have the time:

(3) In addition to the compensation above provided, the injured person shall be furnished by the United States such reasonable governmental medical, surgical, and hospital services and with such supplies, including artificial limbs, trusses, and similar appliances, as the director may determine to be useful and reasonably necessary.

The second proposition is that every man in this body wants these discharged soldiers to receive the best treatment that this Government can give them.

The third proposition is that we must make this provision with the utmost dispatch.

The fourth proposition is that we must do it with absolute certainty. When we leave this body on the 4th of March there must be no doubt that we have performed our full duty to those men in this respect.

Now, what is the situation? If you will take the trouble to read the testimony of Col. Smith, of the Surgeon General's Office, and the report which he submitted to the committee, you will find that Col. Smith, representing the Surgeon General's Office, can assure us of absolutely nothing for months to come, unless possibly it may be some leased buildings, which he himself describes as the least desirable of any of the hospitals that the War Department has.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHELAN. I will in just a minute. Let me read. The chairman of our committee at the committee hearings asked this question:

Can you state as a matter of fact, Col. Smith, that the Public Health Service can get any beds from the War Department within two years from now; and if so, how many? Let us get down to the facts.

Mr. RUCKER. Either at the cantonments or elsewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. Anywhere that would be suitable for hospital purposes.

Col. SMITH. The only beds now used by the War Department which I could state as a matter of fact would probably be released and thus become available to the Public Health Service within the time mentioned would be beds located in buildings which have been leased by the Government for hospital purposes.

Mr. CANNON. On what page is that?

Mr. PHELAN. This is in the hearings, page 15 of No. 16. That is one of his statements.

Mr. DYER. Just there I want to ask—

Mr. PHELAN. In a moment. The gentleman would not yield to me, but I will yield to him in a few minutes. Now, on page 22 of that same document he makes a written report, to which he gave a great deal of thought and time, because we asked him a great many questions relative to this phase of the situation. In that report he says:

It is impossible to state at this time when any of the hospitals now operated by the Army could be released for use by the Public Health Service. While it is believed that we have provision for a sufficient number of beds in Army hospitals, it is also our belief that we require all that we now have in order to provide a reasonable margin of safety for the care of the sick and wounded returning from overseas and the sickness problem which may develop among the troops in this

country and returning for demobilization. We could turn over at once, if approved by the War Department, a general hospital which is about to be opened at Hot Springs, N. C., namely, United States Army General Hospital No. 23, which has a capacity of approximately 700 beds. This is the only hospital which could be turned over immediately.

Then he goes on to speak of something which might be done relative to the leased hospitals.

While I am on this subject, suppose we turn again to the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PHELAN. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 10 minutes. I should like to go into this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that his time be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHELAN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman stated that in the hearings Col. Smith said there were no facilities which the War Department could turn over to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

Mr. PHELAN. I did not mean to say that, and I am sure I did not say that. I said that Col. Smith said he could give us no assurance as to when they could turn over anything.

Mr. DYER. Now, the gentleman says that Col. Smith has asked from the Secretary of War authority to readmit and take into the hospitals that are now half empty a lot of these men—

Mr. PHELAN. That does not necessarily conflict with anything I said.

Mr. DYER. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. PHELAN. I do not know what he has in contemplation. He may want more money. He may want more hospitals. He may want to do a number of things that are provided for in this bill.

Mr. DYER. But the hearings show that the hospitals are not built.

Mr. PHELAN. But we have his written statement, which he wrote after he had been interrogated in the committee hearings, and had gone to his office and had had time to think the thing over, and that statement is what I quoted last.

Mr. DYER. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Does he not think it is a better policy and in the interest of the taxpayers of the country to give the War Department authority to look after these cases in hospitals which will be practically no expense to the country than to create another set of hospitals under another jurisdiction?

Mr. PHELAN. I certainly do not, and I do not believe the American people in such a case will ever want to put civilians under military control. I make no criticism whatsoever of our Military Establishment when I say that; but I certainly am not in favor of that policy, when we can get proper accommodations for them elsewhere.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHELAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. How long will it take to construct the hospitals that you seek to authorize?

Mr. PHELAN. I can not answer that; but I will call the attention of the gentleman to the constant misapprehension in discussing this bill. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] brought out the point.

The bill provides that these hospitals can be "acquired"—acquired, for example, from some other department of the Government—so that when the gentleman asks "How long will it take to construct them?" he gives the impression that they have all got to be constructed. They expect that they can construct them in about six months, but they do not have to wait for that; they can lease them or they can get them from other branches of the Government.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman will correct me if I am wrong. In my judgment, this contemplates that the hospitals will take from 12 months to 3 years to build. Now, I am under the impression—not that I have seen them, but I think I am authorized to make the statement—that at the camps and cantonments there are now hospital beds under the control of the War Department for over 100,000 men; and if the gentleman will allow me, and I know he desires to be candid, as I do, that in the barracks, especially for most of the tuberculous treatment, there would be room for one hundred to two hundred thousand more, for all that class of patients that are treated by sunshine and air and proper food.

Mr. PHELAN. I am coming to that, I will say to the gentleman, and I think the gentleman will agree with me. I have a good deal to explain. If Members will look at page 25 of the hearings No. 16, they will see what the War Department has in the way of hospitals and will find that they have four permanent hospitals. Col. Smith stated that not one could be turned over to the Public Health Service at any time.

Mr. GILLET. Why not?

Mr. PHELAN. Because the buildings were all constructed and existed before this war ever started. They were using them for the Army then, and if the buildings were, as we presume they are, only reasonably sufficient to take care of the Army purposes then, they will be needed to provide the Army purposes after the war is over. There are only four of them. You will find general hospitals at the Army posts. Yet Col. Smith stated that none of these would be available, and the reason is the same. The Army post hospitals all existed before the war, and every one of them will be needed after the war. They were used for the forces before the war started, and we can not expect that the War Department can get along without them after the war is over.

Now, in the minority report, when they are telling of the hospitals that can be acquired, you will find that every single building that they mention is a leased hospital, leased by the War Department, and owned—leased under the restriction that when the war ceases the department will have no authority to extend the lease beyond a very short time. More than that, the War Department has stated that if there are buildings that can be turned over to the Public Health Service, they will turn them over, and our bill provides that thing shall be done if it is advisable. So the plan mentioned in the minority report will be followed under this very bill to which the minority report objects if it is desirable and advantageous to do it. So that when they say that we have hospitals already they are confusing the issue, because every hospital that they name is made available as a leased hospital.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is it not better to have the hospitals leased instead of being built, because they will not be needed after a few years?

Mr. PHELAN. That is only begging the question, because there is nothing in the bill to prevent that thing from being done. We specifically provide that the Public Health Service may lease buildings.

Mr. GILLET. Does the gentleman think that the Public Health Service or any other department of the Government will avail itself of that provision?

Mr. PHELAN. I think the general tendency under the administrative branch of the Government, under any administration, under any political party, is to build rather than to lease. I will say this to the gentleman, however, to get down to the meat of the question, what are you going to do about it? What are gentlemen opposed to the bill proposing to do? They propose nothing. I will answer the gentleman's question further by reading the proviso:

Provided, That nothing shall be expended out of the amounts authorized by this act until all buildings, grounds, furniture, and furnishings available for hospital purposes not needed by the said departments or officers of the Government hereinbefore mentioned have been turned over to the Secretary of the Treasury.

While I do not think that is absolutely binding, that they must turn over leased buildings, I think it shows the intention of Congress, and has a strong tendency to induce any administrative department to avoid unnecessary construction.

But to get back to the facts, we have got to take care of these men. How are you going to do it? Are you going to leave here on the 4th of March with everything uncertain in the face of the Surgeon General's statement that he does not know where he can turn anything over to the service of discharged soldiers needing hospital treatment? The gentleman from Illinois stated that there is a contest between those who favor turning them over to the Public Health Service and those favoring turning them over to the military service. I will not deny that there is a contest, but do those favoring military department offer anything in a substantive form. We have got to do something and you can not allow this thing to be hung up in the air. We can not leave it uncertain that these men shall get proper care and medical service when discharged from the Army.

To resume my recapitulation of Army hospitals, in addition to general hospitals, Army post hospitals, and hospitals on leased land, there are some hospitals at the ports of embarkation.

tion which, I think, anybody will agree will be of doubtful value.

Outside of those, the only buildings under the control of the Surgeon General's Office are those at camps and cantonments. There is nothing else available except leased buildings, so that we come to this. If the War Department does turn over any hospitals to the Public Health Service, they must turn over those in leased buildings or those in camps or cantonments. If we fail to enact this bill, then the only hospitals available for discharged soldiers would be hospitals in leased buildings, possibly under the control of the War Department, and hospitals in cantonments and camps.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I shall object unless the gentleman will yield to me. I have asked him to do so two or three times.

Mr. PHELAN. I shall yield to the gentleman, although he would not yield to me, but that does not make any difference.

Mr. KREIDER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not know that he asked me to yield to him.

Mr. PHELAN. Yes; I did.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHELAN. I shall be very glad to yield to the gentleman in a moment. So that we come right down to this: We would have to use those cantonment hospitals or hospitals in leased buildings. If we want to use leased buildings for hospitals, we are going to get the least desirable, and if we are going to use the cantonment hospitals, what do we get? We get, first of all, buildings that are not permanent in their construction; buildings that are not suitable immediately for this purpose; buildings that are not fireproof. Most of them are of wooden construction, one story in height. Some of them have no heating apparatus. While there is some testimony that they might be changed into permanent hospitals, there is no testimony that they can be made fireproof, and I say it would be a crime to put boys coming out of our Army, suffering from some disease that is incurable perhaps, into any buildings not fireproof in construction. I shall not vote for any such thing. We come then to this proposition: Are we going to take a chance that somebody somewhere, and there is no evidence where it is coming from in any of the testimony, will make provisions for these men who are discharged from our military and naval services? Are we going to take a chance that from some place we will get those accommodations, or are we going to take a chance that somebody will spend some money, possibly a little more than necessary, while making it absolutely sure that we will have proper quarters and accommodations in hospitals for the men who have been fighting for this country?

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes.

Mr. KREIDER. Does the gentleman overlook the fact that all the testimony in the hearings is to the effect that these hospitals shall be built for tuberculosis patients?

Mr. PHELAN. I do not overlook it, because it is not so.

Mr. KREIDER. Yes, it is; if the gentleman will read the hearings and refer to them he will find that that is the actual fact.

Mr. PHELAN. I do not judge what a bill states by reading the hearings. I judge what a bill states by reading the bill. There is nothing in the bill, and it is not so contemplated, because we asked every man repeatedly coming before the committee about men suffering from Bright's disease and other incurable diseases.

Mr. KREIDER. And the answer was that they would be taken care of in the hospitals throughout the country.

Mr. PHELAN. I differ with the gentleman. This bill attempts to make certain that we are going to have provision for these boys and does not leave it doubtful, not leave it in what seems to be the condition that no accommodations or at best not sufficient accommodations can possibly be provided for them otherwise. Which are we going to do? Are we going to take a chance that such a thing will occur? Suppose the Congress does not convene until next December, suppose hundreds, yes, thousands of these boys ought to be taken care of by some branch of the United States Government, and suppose there are no existing facilities available, suppose we give no authority to anybody to do anything, what a condition of affairs will confront us, at least until Congress reconvenes. To what a serious and indefensible charge of neglect do we leave ourselves open? There will be absolutely nobody who can do anything if we fail to do our duty here. It is as plain as can be to me, as the

gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] so well stated, that something must be done, and that something must be done now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. WOODYARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for one minute, so that I may ask him a question.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, Mr. Chairman, let us have a vote on the amendment.

Mr. MANN. I would like to get a vote upon my amendment and have it disposed of if I can.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending on which there has been the usual discussion on each side.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON. What is the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Adding the Marine Corps. The gentleman from Florida has called for a vote. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk again reported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that all debate is exhausted.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to offer an amendment to the amendment, although I suppose it would be in order to offer that amendment later, and I shall reserve my right to offer an amendment later.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment pending, and I hope the gentleman will let us have that disposed of.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to suggest that neither the amendment nor the bill includes Army nurses, female, nor does the bill include members of the Coast Guard who may have been disabled or injured during the war. I call attention to these facts to show how imperfect the bill is. I would seek by my amendment to include these two classes, and I shall do so just as soon as the opportunity arrives.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLARK of Florida: Page 1, line 8, after the word "service," insert a comma.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, at the proper point I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, to insert "Army nurses, female, and members of the Coast Guard during the period of the war."

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman can accomplish his purpose by inserting the words "Army nurses," without regard to sex.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Male nurses would be included as "soldiers." "Army nurses, female," includes women who have been in the service and who may have been injured and need medical treatment. Some have been injured.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. What is the amendment?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I had no opportunity to write it. The gentleman was in such haste to press his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "Marines," in the Mann amendment, insert "Army nurses, females, and members of the Coast Guard during the period of the war."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that members of the United States Coast Guard Service are entitled to treatment under the Public Health Service.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is a matter of such consequence that we have been obliged to include it in the revenue bill.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Well, if the gentleman will permit me to call his attention to the fact that the law now provides the following classes shall be treated in the Public Health Service: Merchant seamen, the Mississippi River Commission, the United States Coast Guard Service, the United States Lighthouse Service, the Engineer Corps of the United States Army, the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, civilian employees injured under the workmen's compensation act, civilian employees injured on Army transports, and cases of discharged soldiers and sailors, under the war-risk insurance act of October 6, 1917.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That applies to any time, whether within the war period or without?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Absolutely.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It may refer to a man injured five years from now or one injured five years before the war?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Surely.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I take it that is not the purpose of this bill, to provide that injuries not due to the war—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Why, Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentlemen this bill is simply to provide for the building of hospitals to take care of all those people who are entitled to treatment at the hands of the Public Health Service under existing law, and in lines 7 and 8 the gentleman will see—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understand a member of the Coast Guard ordinarily would be treated by the Marine Hospital Service, or a sailor upon a merchantman, provided he were properly qualified, but I take it this is a war act, that the gentlemen who are advocating this—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; it is an after-the-war act.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania (continuing). Are urging the passage on the ground of the necessity of taking care of the soldiers who were injured on the other side of the water and who are coming home—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. And who have been discharged.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Now it is proposed to expand the service of the Marine Hospital so that under this appropriation any old thing can take place at any time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, no; it is not, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me; we have a statute declaring that each of these classes of people shall be entitled to treatment by the Public Health Service. That is existing law to-day. Congress has enacted those laws and Congress is under obligation to provide hospitals necessary to treat these people. Now, here comes another class of people, to wit, discharged soldiers, marines, and sailors, whom the War Department, through the Army hospitals, will not treat. They can not under the law, so hospitals have to be provided, and in providing for them the bill simply states these hospitals should be built for the treatment of persons entitled to treatment under the Public Health Service, and the Public Health Service will divide these people out into the different hospitals according to their classes, I assume, as they are entitled to be treated. Now, if the gentleman is really in earnest and wants to get his amendment in to take care of the nurses I think there is no objection to it. I think if they are injured in any way or become sick in the service, that after they have been discharged they would be entitled to it now under the operation of the law. The law makes no distinction as to sex. The gentleman ought to know that where "he" is used it includes "she" in every statute that ever was enacted in this country, but if the gentleman thinks it is necessary to provide particularly for female nurses—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania. I ask that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as follows: Insert after the word "marines," where it appears in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the words "Army and Navy nurses."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not accept that amendment, Mr. Chairman, because it does not specifically include females. Male is already covered by existing law, but female is not, as I understand it.

Mr. GARD. I have no objection to its being included. It is my purpose, I will say to the gentleman, to include the Army and Navy nurses, whether they be male or female. I think they are probably included in the law, and I think this language does include them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARD offers a substitute amendment to the amendment of Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: After the word "marines," in the Mann amendment, insert "Army and Navy nurses."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. We will accept the substitute.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I beg to offer an amendment as a substitute that will meet all these difficulties that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is trying to meet, and that is to add to the substitute the words "male or female."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would accept that amendment.

Mr. GARD. I have no objection to that. I would suggest, also, as brought to my attention by a member of the committee, that after the word "all" insert "Army and Navy nurses, male or female."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Ohio accept the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am satisfied to accept it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I would like to say a word about it. I want to ask these gentlemen a question. I know the gentleman at my left, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD], is a lawyer, the gentleman at my right, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], I believe, is not a lawyer. I want to know if these gentlemen seriously insist that the language "Army and Navy nurses" would not cover "male and female" nurses? Do they seriously insist on this proposition on this floor of the American Congress in this day of progress and civilization?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will say to the gentleman from Florida that the same question has been raised in a conference now being held on a great revenue bill, as to including female nurses who have been injured in the war on the other side, some of whom are coming back on crutches.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does the gentleman seriously insist that the word "female" ought to go in?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to say to the gentleman frankly that I am not in favor of the bill as reported.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman is not going to support the bill anyhow?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I expect to oppose the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. So the gentleman is a Greek bearing gifts?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not necessarily. I thought if this bill was going through and the gentleman has sufficient votes to pass it or rush it through without care and consideration being given to it I would try to perfect it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman is not trying to perfect it by this amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the amendment is highly proper. I would dislike to see the female nurses who labored in the war on the other side excluded from this bill.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Let us have a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question first is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] to amend the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

The question was taken, and the amendment to the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] for the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the vote is being taken. I think the Chair should separate the question. I suggest it is debatable.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It is not debatable while the motion is being put, and I think that all debate has been exhausted on the proposition.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Chair stated the question, and I rose to express myself.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman has been standing all the time. He has not taken his seat.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

The question was taken, and the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate is exhausted. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. You can not do it while the vote is being taken.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thought the vote had been taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania as amended by the substitute of the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds is entitled to our consideration and respect in matters of this kind, but it is easily persuaded to bring in these housing, ground-purchasing, building-constructing measures. It abandoned its purpose to bring in an omnibus bill for reasons which I do not clearly understand, but brings in one that threatens danger in the matter of the use and possible waste of public money. It proposes to bring in other special bills of this

kind, some of which may tend to appall the House, and for that reason I rise and state why, in my judgment, this bill ought to go back to the committee in order that the House may have an opportunity to more carefully consider this very important question of taking care of our injured and sick soldiers.

The boys who are coming back from Europe, those who are being unnecessarily detained over there now, as many of us believe, those who are in the camps and who can not get home to obtain the employment that awaits them, are the very boys that are going to pay for this ground and these buildings that we make appropriations for so lavishly. I am hearing from the employers of these boys now, and from many of the boys themselves, with respect to the expenditures the Government is authorizing for what is believed to be needless purposes. The great tax measure, which must come into the House very soon for approval by this body and another, is being objected to by the substantial men of the United States because it is going to deprive them, they contend, of the opportunity to employ such agencies as they can to give employment to these returning soldiers.

I want to care for the sick. I will go as far as any man in this House to vote the sums requisite for the care of our soldiers. I will go further and help to get them employment, which I am mighty anxious they shall have on their return to the United States, and from which they are being held now in order that this Government may keep its deals with other Governments, about which we in Congress know very little. But I do not believe that in this unfinished, lackadaisical way we should delegate to one bureau or another the power not only to appropriate \$10,000,000 specifically, but the power to buy land, grounds, buildings anywhere that a bureaucrat desires to purchase, operate, on the pretense that we are doing it to help the returning soldiers.

This bill gives the Secretary of the Treasury the power to purchase existing buildings, grounds, and equipment. Why, we have been doing nothing but purchasing grounds ever since this war began. We wasted \$640,000,000 on aircraft that never gave our boys on the other side a look-in in the matter of aviation, except as we borrowed or bought the machines of foreign nations. The minority report in this particular instance shows that we have hospital facilities now for all the returning soldiers who need hospital attention. But a bureau steps in and asks for power to buy more ground and build more buildings, when we have spent \$50,000,000 for housing—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This very Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds came in during the war with housing bills for the Department of Labor, and the result—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman can help me get five minutes more, I will agree to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will try to get the gentleman five minutes more. Can the gentleman inform the House where in the hearings it is stated that there is ample hospital accommodations for these soldiers?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Take the minority report.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No. Will the gentleman point out in the hearings where it is shown that there is ample hospital accommodation for discharged soldiers and sailors? If the gentleman can do that, then I am willing to withdraw the bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am willing to take the word of four Members of Congress, two Republicans and two Democrats, who in their minority report show that we have ample hospital facilities.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] tells me that he did not authorize his name to be signed to the minority report.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I observe that there are signed to this minority report the names of AARON S. KREIDER, of Pennsylvania, R. N. ELLIOTT, of Indiana, H. A. BARNHART, of Indiana, and J. J. MANSFIELD, of Texas.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; I will yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KREIDER. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the statements in the report regarding hospitals and vacant beds are taken from the hearings, and were taken from them verbatim. I copied them myself, and they are printed exactly as they appeared in the hearings.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I take the gentleman's word.

Mr. KREIDER. I further wish to say that Col. Smith in his testimony, in Document No. 14, states clearly, in reply to the question asked by the chairman of the committee covering two statements made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] on the floor of the House, that there are over 50,000 vacant beds; and I would suggest that the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the committee, in the statement he made this morning regarding the Secretary of the Treasury, reports having received a letter in which Mr. Secretary Glass refers to 50,000 patients. I want to suggest that this morning the Surgeon General's office reports about 45,000 beds now vacant and 15,000 more to be about completed; in all, 60,000 vacant beds.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; 60,000 vacant beds to accommodate 50,000 patients—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. In the same statement in which Col. Smith stated that, he stated that the Army needed every one of them. The minority report takes a part of the testimony and leaves out the rest.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I always yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want also to call attention to the fact that if the gentlemen on the other side got any such information from Col. Smith or from the Surgeon General's office it is a deliberate and absolute contradiction of the letter from Col. Willford H. Smith, of the Surgeon General's office, addressed to me and printed as Exhibit D, on page 2056, of the RECORD of Saturday, printed as an exhibit to my remarks, in which Col. Smith said—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman will pardon me. I can not yield unless I have more time.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I will ask that the gentleman have more time, if it is necessary, to get through. He says, "Total number of beds now vacant, 42,530." That was the condition on January 17, 1919.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is substantially what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] stated. The armistice was signed November 11, 1918. December 11 would be one month, January 11 would be two months, and we are now in the third month, and approaching the end of it, since the armistice was signed; and if we have a vast number of injured on the other side we ought to be informed of it by this time. If it is necessary to go into these new expenditures I am ready to do it, but there is no information, so far as I can gather, that we are now beyond hospital capacity for every boy who needs hospital attention.

Now, since the gentleman has put his figures into the RECORD in this short speech of mine, I will put in the RECORD the figures that the minority of the committee give me, using only the grand totals. Here is a long list of hospitals, general hospitals, camp base hospitals, and hospitals under the direction of the Surgeon General at the ports of embarkation at Hoboken, at Newport News, and large department base hospitals. All these show, according to the minority report, a standard capacity of 98,293, or substantially 100,000 beds—occupied but 59,628 and vacant 52,598. Now, will some gentleman who knows tell me how many men are to be accommodated at the present time? Do we need to spend this additional \$10,000,000 and start a still greater expenditure?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In a moment. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] told me he called upon the War Department this morning and found that 45,000 beds are now vacant. If that is true the minority report is not deceptive, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania says his figures are taken from the hearings. They have 52,598 beds to accommodate 45,000 patients. Now I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. The thought I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania here to elaborate on is that the accommodations sought to be created by the authority of this bill are not intended for the use of soldiers at all, but are intended for the use of men who get out of the service.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; that is what the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] admitted in his statement a little while ago. That is what the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] admitted in his discussion with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] on Saturday, that these hospitals were to become substantially a permanent institution, to give extended jurisdiction to the Public Health Service to take care of everybody, at any time, without regard to the war.

Mr. MADDEN. Not soldiers, but civilians.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Civilians; that is true. That is the argument, as I understood it. I want to care for these returning soldiers. I want to take care of them until we can put them on their feet to get employment again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am going to object. The gentleman has had 20 minutes already, I think.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I have had 10 minutes, and nearly all of that was taken up by the gentlemen on that side.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think the gentleman has had his time extended twice.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is so important a matter that there ought to be a quorum present.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think so, too, and I am going to insist that they stay here until we finish this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KEARNS. Has the Chair counted to ascertain whether there is a quorum present or not?

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KEARNS. Is it too late to ask for tellers?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Chair has announced that there is no quorum present, and there was no quorum present when the Chair made the announcement, and he directed the Clerk to call the roll. It is evident that there is no quorum present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Alexander	Dyer	Kennedy, R. I.	Scully
Austin	Edmonds	Key, Ohio	Sears
Bacharach	Emerson	Lea, Cal.	Shackleford
Benson	Essen	Leshner	Siegel
Beshlin	Estopinal	Little	Slomp
Birch	Ferris	Lobeck	Small
Booher	Fields	London	Smith, C. R.
Borland	Flynn	McAndrews	Smith, T. F.
Britten	Focht	McCormick	Snyder
Brodbeck	Francis	McKeown	Stephens, Nebr.
Browning	Freeman	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sterling
Brumbaugh	Fuller, Mass.	Maher	Stevenson
Caldwell	Garrett, Tex.	Mason	Stiness
Carew	Good	Mondell	Strong
Carter, Mass.	Goodall	Montague	Sullivan
Chandler, N. Y.	Gordon	Morin	Swift
Church	Graham, Pa.	Mott	Tague
Cleary	Gray, N. J.	Mudd	Taylor, Ark.
Cooper, Ohio	Gregg	Neely	Templeton
Cooper, Wis.	Griest	Norton	Thomas
Copley	Hamill	Overstreet	Tinkham
Costello	Hamilton, N. Y.	Park	Vare
Cox	Harrison, Miss.	Parker, N. Y.	Venable
Crago	Haskell	Phelan	Voigt
Crosser	Hawley	Platt	Waldow
Curry, Cal.	Hayes	Pratt	Walker
Davey	Heaton	Price	Ward
Davis	Heintz	Rainey, H. T.	Watson, Pa.
Delaney	Helm	Reavis	Welty
Dempsey	Helvering	Riordan	Whaley
Dewalt	Houston	Roberts	White, Ohio
Dickinson	Husted	Rowe	Wilson, Ill.
Dill	Hutchinson	Rowland	Winslow
Donovan	Johnson, Ky.	Russell	Wise
Doelling	Keating	Sanders, La.	Wood, Ind.
Drane	Kelley, Mich.	Sanford	
Drukker	Kennedy, Iowa	Schall	
Dunn			

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARDY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13026) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers and sailors, found itself without a quorum, whereupon he caused the roll to be called, when 279 Members, a quorum, answered to their names, and he presented the names of the absentees to be printed in the Journal and RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its session.

Accordingly the committee resumed its session, with Mr. HARDY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] had a pro forma amendment pending. The Chair assumes that that will be considered as withdrawn.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the committee, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the committee, and I want to reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. KREIDER. I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is a member of the committee. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Alabama later.

Mr. KREIDER. I simply wanted to call the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHELAN] to a statement in the hearings. I do not see the gentleman on the floor now. I propounded a question to him, in which he indicated that I was in error. I simply want to say that it is only an indication of how short men's memories are. The question was to the diseases with which these soldiers are afflicted. I read from hearing No. 14, page 34. The question was asked by the chairman of the committee:

Now, Doctor, tell me this: What are these hospitals for?

Dr. BANKS. For soldiers and sailors discharged from the military and naval service of the United States on account of disabilities incurred in line of duty.

The CHAIRMAN. Suffering from any disease?

Dr. BANKS. No; especially tuberculosis, for the reason that the large problem of discharged soldiers is tuberculosis. About 25 per cent of those discharged are suffering from that disease.

The CHAIRMAN. About how many?

Dr. BANKS. About 25 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you have got 75 per cent who are suffering from other troubles?

This was the question denied by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHELAN], who said I was in error.

Dr. BANKS. Yes; of general miscellaneous character, either injuries or organic diseases, like heart disease, kidney disease, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand; but why do you say that all of these are to be especially for tubercular people, when only 25 per cent of them are tubercular?

Dr. BANKS. Because they require longer hospitalization than any other class.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but you have got to have conveniences to take care of the other classes.

Dr. BANKS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you will need more room for the other classes than you will need for the tubercular people?

Dr. BANKS. Well, it is considered desirable to segregate that class.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I say, but the fact is you need more space?

Dr. BANKS. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. For others than you will need for the tubercular ones.

Dr. BANKS. Well, I doubt it, because—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Well, if there is 75 per cent of them, you certainly will.

Dr. BANKS. Well, they are of a class that can be treated at their homes, such as kidney disease and heart disease.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't mean that the Government is going to treat them at their homes?

Dr. BANKS. The Government is obligated to do it in one way or another.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean for them to have their own physicians?

Dr. BANKS. To have their own physicians.

The CHAIRMAN. To have local physicians?

Dr. BANKS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I didn't catch that.

Dr. BANKS. They are to have their local physicians.

The CHAIRMAN. Then it is your idea that the Government will employ local physicians all over the country to treat these people?

Dr. BANKS. They will have to do it, because these men will be located all over the United States in small villages and out-of-the-way places.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, let us go a little slow here. I want to get as clear an understanding as a layman may get of this thing. It may sound very foolish to you, some of these questions, but nevertheless you are not talking to a group of doctors now, you know.

What would you say would be the proportion of space to be provided for those patients suffering from diseases that are not tubercular who will go to hospitals? Leave out the home treatment.

Dr. BANKS. Well, in the first place you have got to consider the tuberculosis situation. There are at present about 14,000 beds.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to cut that out and listen to the other for a minute or so.

Dr. BANKS. I wanted to say, as a basis for my statement, there are 14,000 beds throughout the United States for tuberculosis—that is, in hospitals especially devoted to tuberculosis. We have already got between 14,000 and 15,000 discharged. That is not taking into account these sanatoria which are already filled with civilian population. Consequently we have got to provide for this 14,000 elsewhere than in existing sanatoria. Now, the general hospitals of the United States are much more numerous than tuberculosis hospitals. I don't know the bed space of the general hospitals throughout the United States, but it is not adequate to take care of all these special diseases. For instance, we have nearly 4,000 discharges for epilepsy from the Army.

I refer to these matters to show that the proponents of this bill are not arguing in accordance with the testimony of men who appeared before the committee. It is not for the benefit

of the returned soldiers. The chairman asked the question in plain language, "Now, Doctor, tell us what these hospitals are for," and he tells plainly what they are for in as plain language as a man can speak. Now, I want to answer the question of the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I shall have to object.

Mr. KREIDER. I only want five minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will not object at this time provided the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] can have a little more time.

Mr. KREIDER. I shall not object to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Now, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. KREIDER. I will.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman says that these hospitals are not for people in the Army. Did not they all state that there were 14,000 tubercular patients who had been discharged from the Army, and that they looked for 20,000 more?

Mr. KREIDER. The gentleman knows that those were not men coming from France, men who had been over the sea. Not one of them came from the other side.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, oh, the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. KREIDER. Here we have the proposition as to who are the patients. I call your attention to the question which the chairman asked, what are the hospitals for, and the answer that they are for the patients of the War Risk Insurance Bureau. Now, who are these men? I want to answer that by reading from the hearings, page 32:

Dr. BANKS. These men have been drafted into the Army by the Government; they have been taken away from their occupations and their previous methods of existence, you might say, involuntarily. They have been taken by process of law, and they have made no representations regarding physical conditions, and the Government took them as they stood. That is the equity of the case from their standpoint.

Mr. BURNETT. Then, if they are examined the next week, even, by the surgeon at the camps and turned down, they are entitled to compensation from the War Risk Insurance Board?

Dr. BANKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Although they have never seen any service and haven't been from their homes over perhaps a week or two?

Dr. BANKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is an outrage.

Mr. BURNETT. You say we passed a law to that effect, or is that merely a construction?

Dr. BANKS. No, sir; that is a law of Congress.

Mr. BURNETT. Then we are responsible for it?

Dr. BANKS. Not only that, but Congress amended the law to make that possible. It was not asked for by the War Risk Insurance Board.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Well, we are a set of chumps, then.

Mr. RUCKER. As a matter of fact, if I may put in a word, I think that is right.

[Laughter.]

Now, I want to make these two points clear as to who are the patients of the War Risk Insurance Bureau, what are the hospitals intended for, and I want to say emphatically, according to the evidence I have read, that they are not for the returned soldiers over the sea. Those men are taken care of by the War Department, and they are on record as saying that they will not discharge them as long as they need hospital treatment. Now, there is a sinister reason back of all this. There is not a Member of Congress who desires to deprive a soldier of any benefit and accommodations he needs, or who desires not to do the thing for the soldier, but we can not afford to close our eyes to unnecessary expenditures of the public funds. I am in favor of the stipulation or the amendment written in the bill by the committee providing for the taking over of any hospitals, turning over patients from the War Department, and if that is done we need not expend \$10,500,000. I would be perfectly willing to strike out the \$10,000,000 and let the \$500,000 stand.

I do think that there is a hospital needed at Norfolk, but I do not think we need to build these hospitals in 14 different cities in the United States for these purposes, because we now have all the hospital capacity that is necessary to take care of our soldiers. [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, the memory of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] is very defective, indeed. When he comes to make his minority report he simply selects such parts of the testimony of Col. Smith as he thinks bear on his position in opposition to this bill and leaves out the important part of that testimony. I am going to call attention to it. The gentleman talks about the boys coming back from the other side. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] says that

they will have to pay part of this expense. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that there is a soldier coming back from the other side but what will be willing to pay his part of the taxes which we will have to pay to care for or heal those that are discharged both from the other side and this side on account of disabilities for which this Government ought to take care of them.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has referred to this, and I would like to know—and possibly the gentleman from Pennsylvania may know, because in a few weeks he will have an opportunity to vote on the question—whether he is willing for a crowd of aliens from the other side to be kept from these shores and kept from taking the jobs of returning soldiers from the trenches and camps. We will see how the gentleman stands when he gets a chance to vote on such a bill.

In regard to disabled men that have been inducted into the service under the draft, the incompetency, if there is any, is in the War Department and the men of those boards that have passed men as being physically satisfactory, and the same men have been returned from the camps by the Government surgeons. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that in the War Department we have incompetency in almost every detail. I want to read, because perhaps some gentlemen have not read it, an item from the Washington Star with reference to soldiers at the Walter Reed Hospital. Last Saturday this statement was made to the Star by some of the men, and if there was nothing more to get soldiers from under the control of the War Department which would impel me to vote for this bill this statement would.

I want to read just a few lines from it, to show how these soldier boys are treated—not by the hospital but by the War Department itself:

The regulations, one of the officers said, do not provide for the laundering by the Government, or at Government cost, of the clothes of the men who are able to attend to their own laundry. If the men find the work irksome all they need to do is to have their clothes sent to a city laundry and pay for the work in the regular way at the regular prices. Neither the quartermaster nor the adjutant has power to change a military regulation. The machine must operate in the usual way. Sentiment does not govern a military organization, he said.

As many of the men have not been paid for several months and are without funds, the question of their paying to have their laundry done is eliminated.

As a one-armed man yesterday was washing his shirt in the bathtub he remarked to a reporter he was sure that this great, rich country, for the safety of which he had in common with scores of thousands of others given his blood, did not desire that the crippled soldiers should do their own washing. A group of six or seven men, all leaning on crutches, each shorn of a leg, awaited their turn at the common clothes washing bathtub and good-naturedly urged him to "carry on."

"You see it's like this," said one of the men who had left his leg in France, "we must either do our own washing or not have it done at all. There is no laundry here for the use of the men. At least we haven't been able to find one. When I had two good legs I didn't mind washing my clothes."

"We used to do it at the Argonne and in other parts of France," then he opened his upper shirt and pointing to the garment beneath, said:

"I have worn this underwear three weeks. I hate like fury to wash it in the bathtub. We could send it down town and have it done at the ordinary rate of expense. But men on \$30 a month, who have suffered as we have suffered, feel that the country ought at least do our washing for us."

"Then, again, many of us haven't received any pay for seven or eight months. We are told that we are going to get it. I have had my account fixed up and O. K.'d, and I am told it will come; but I am wondering when, and a great many other boys are wondering the same thing."

HAVE TO BORROW CAR FARE.

It is not an uncommon thing to see several soldiers late in the afternoon trying to borrow a dime from their more financially fortunate "bunkies" to pay car fare down town and back.

That is the way the War Department is taking care of the boys from the other side. I repeat, if there was nothing else in this bill than the proposition to take it from the War Department and put the matter under the control of the Treasury Department—that is, the care of those discharged from the service—it would evoke my approval and my vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman states that the War Department is inefficient and incompetent to do this work. How does he figure that the Treasury Department will do better?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I have never heard any complaint of the Bureau of the Public Health Service in regard to the functions they have been called upon to perform. I say candidly that if it was to be left to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance under the Treasury Department, as it has func-

tioned heretofore, I should be as intensely opposed to it as I am intensely in favor of this proposition coming under the Public Health Service, although, to do justice to those in charge now of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, I want to say that under the present management I have seen a great improvement.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I want to ask a question for information. There have been so many contradictory statements made in the course of this debate that some of us are in doubt as to what to do. What has the gentleman to say in regard to the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] that, as a matter of fact, none of the hospitals to be provided for by this bill would be used by the soldiers returning from abroad?

Mr. BURNETT. I do not understand it in any such way.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has made that positive assertion.

Mr. BURNETT. The gentleman is altogether incorrect. I want to show what the gentleman from Pennsylvania omitted from his report, and that will show exactly what the gentleman was wanting to put in and what he wanted to leave out. He quotes from Col. Smith's testimony. Col. Smith said:

It is impossible to state at this time when any of the hospitals now operated by the Army could be released for use by the Public Health Service. While it is believed that we have provision for a sufficient number of beds in Army hospitals, it is also our belief that we require all that we now have in order to provide a reasonable margin of safety for the care of sick and wounded returning from overseas, and the sickness problem which may develop among the troops in this country and returning for demobilization.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, in making his minority report, left that out. Let me read you just a little more that he also left out in regard to the hospitals that could be made available. Col. Smith says:

As to the date when any others could be turned over, it is impossible to state at this time, for that depends upon the number of patients for whom we must make provision and the type of the case, which determines the duration of their stay in hospital. It is believed, however, that in six months several of those hospitals could be released, but not before that. The permanent general hospitals would not be available at all.

That is the language of Col. Smith, which the gentleman left from his minority report, and yet it immediately preceded what the gentleman from Pennsylvania did quote.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BURNETT. The gentleman has his own time.

Mr. KREIDER. I know, but the gentleman makes an accusation. I want simply to say this, that none of the general hospitals that are owned by the Government are suitable for tuberculosis patients, but there are eight hospitals under the control of the War Department that are, and I enumerate them in my report and give their capacity in respect to beds, and so forth; so that I have been entirely fair.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania name these hospitals and will he point out in the Record where the War Department has ever said they would turn over a single one to the Public Health Service? They said positively they would not.

Mr. KREIDER. I can do it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Let the gentleman do it in his own time.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, here we have been two days on this bill. A short time ago there was one hospital that we asked to have constructed, and gentlemen over on that side, who are now rallying against this bill, made the argument that there ought to be a general scheme for such hospitals. Now we come in with a general scheme and for two days gentlemen have been fighting that. Mr. Chairman, we are going to have tuberculosis patients all along, men that have come not only from the ranks in the camps here, but from the shot and shell and the snow and sleet and trenches on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNETT. Some one I hear says something about my not hurrying along. Who has been doing the talking? This is the first time that I have spoken, and I would not have taken the floor now had not the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MODER] made the speech he did in regard to turning it over to the War Department. We do not know how big the Army is going to be. We do not know how long these brave men are going to be kept on the other side. We ought not to limit the space that a single soldier gets from the hospitals that the

Government now has under the charge of the War Department. If this bill gave only one resting place, one sanatorium, for one single tubercular patient, it would be enough for me to say that we ought to spend the ten and a half million dollars and do it at once. If only one man's life can be preserved, if only one sick or wounded soldier or nurse who went with the Red Cross to the other side is saved, it is enough for me. These people took their lives in their hands and risked them on the call of our Government. I hope gentlemen will not delay longer by wrangling over what department shall have control, when we know that the Public Health Service has heretofore had this very character of work under its control. I hope we will not jeopardize by postponing and delaying one minute longer a bill that affects the very life of many brave men and women who offered their lives for their country. [Applause.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, in view of the fact that my name appears signed to the minority report, and in view of the further fact that reference has been made to my attitude in reference to this bill, I feel in justice to myself and in deference to the majority of the committee it is necessary for me to make a brief statement. I did not join in the minority report as appears of record in this matter. My name is there by inadvertence. I did vote against reporting the bill in the committee because from the light before me at that time I did not think that all this expenditure of money was necessary—and I have not yet thoroughly made up my mind upon that point—but after I returned to my office from the committee meeting a member of the majority inquired over the phone as to whether or not I would acquiesce in the majority report. I told them if I decided not to do so I would let them know. That was the last I heard of the matter until a few days ago, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] showed me a typewritten copy of the minority report, and inasmuch as I had voted against reporting the bill my name appeared upon this typewritten copy of the minority report. I explained the matter to the gentleman [Mr. KREIDER], and he scratched my name off. But somehow, by some means which I am unable to explain, it appears that some other copy of the report was inadvertently handed to the printer, and my name is printed there. Now, here, gentlemen, is my attitude with reference to these hospitals. I would rather have 10,000 too many beds for returning soldiers than to have one too few. I do not like the idea, however, of having more than 50,000 vacant beds with strings to them, because I want hospital beds that can be used for every discharged soldier, sailor, or marine who may be in need of them; and if we have got 40,000 or 50,000 beds which can not be used for that purpose, I think we need some legislation that will make them available. I do not like the idea of having thousands of beds too many under one branch of the Government and a thousand too few under another. I want it so that every soldier, every sailor, every marine, and every nurse who needs a bed shall be supplied with that hospital bed if the Government of the United States is able to afford it, and I think it is. Gentlemen, I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON rose.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Illinois desire to offer a real amendment?

Mr. CANNON. I want to offer a real amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move the following amendment: To strike out in line 7, beginning with the word "and." I will read the amendment:

And for others entitled to treatment by the Public Health Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON. Page 1, line 7, strike out the following: "and for others entitled to treatment by the Public Health Service."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman will yield to me just a moment, I want simply to give notice that I am going to try to insist upon the rule being observed hereafter in debate upon this bill. We have talked all day about it.

Mr. CANNON. I know, but you gentlemen have done most of the talking—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; we have not.

Mr. CANNON (continuing). Both upon the committee and off of it. However, I will see when my five minutes are up, and it may be the committee will give me a little more time. It may be I can say all I desire in two minutes or that a man perhaps ought to say. Mr. Chairman, it is time in considering legislation, now that the armistice has been made, and they are coming home to the United States from overseas and being dis-

charged by the tens of thousands, to call a halt in the enactment of legislation and be sure what legislation ought to be enacted. First, what is the real condition; second, what have we to raise revenue for and for what purposes; third, how much useless machinery have we got that is spending money; fourth, what have we to care for in the Treasury for the soldiers and the citizens who are entitled to care; fifth, can we be diverted from the merits of a proposition by patriotic declamations? Why, of course, the United States will take care of every soldier who is entitled to relief under the war-risk act, and those who are entitled to payment or killed and are leaving dependents. Never in the tide of time in this country or any other that ever existed has there been so much guaranteed to the soldiers of any war as we have guaranteed. I merely refer to it. I would not dot an "i" or cross a "t" to take back any pledge we have given to our soldiers, but I am not ready in orating about taking care of the soldier to let creep in along with the soldier the man, the woman, the child, who are not soldiers, and permit them to have relief and treatment in hospitals. Oh, we are caring for the dependents, and that pledge was made if a soldier was killed, and so forth, or if he was wounded, and the Government is caring for the dependents of the soldier by an allotment. It is keeping all of those pledges, every one of them. But now what is the status? First, the civil employees in the War Risk Bureau in the Treasury Department, who never were in the service, not entitled to anything more than anybody else's wife and child and every other civil employee in the Government is entitled to, it is said, and I assume it is true, that we gushed along and are pledged to care for in hospitals now until the time they die, all the civil employees in the War Risk Bureau.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What authority of the law has the gentleman for the statement that the civil employees of the War Risk Bureau would be entitled to the use of these sanatoriums?

Mr. CANNON. The legislation gives it to them. I am correct in that, am I not?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Absolutely not.

Mr. CANNON. Then the whole debate has proceeded along lines that are founded upon a fallacy.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The persons who are entitled to treatment in hospitals as fixed by law are civil employees of the Government injured under the workmen's-compensation act—no relation to the War Risk Bureau at all. And none of the employees of the War Risk Bureau will be entitled to hospital treatment under this bill.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman's own report shows there are others.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; it does not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the draft copy of the sundry civil bill, on which hearings are now in progress, there is an item carrying an appropriation of over \$1,000,000 for the treatment of those afflicted with venereal diseases under the act of the past year. This bill would give provision for that kind of patients.

Mr. RUCKER. Soldiers.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not soldiers.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman knows that the provision of which he speaks will go out under a point of order if anybody makes it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not. The bill specifically enumerates the section under which they claim that authority.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. What has that to do with this?

Mr. STAFFORD. It has direct relation to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois so as to prevent this bureau of health from spreading its arms so as to cover everybody in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for an extension of time. I would like 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for 10 minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. How much?

Mr. CANNON. I would like 10 minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I do not object to this, but—

Mr. CANNON. Do not put it on me. I do not care, so far as that is concerned. I am asking no courtesy that is exceptional. I want to be educated as to what the law is if I do not understand what it is.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will not object. Let the gentleman go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. CANNON. From the best reading that I can do and from the report it seems that I have been in error in believing that the civil employees of the War Risk Bureau were entitled to treatment in these hospitals.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Permit me right there, as long as the gentleman has 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Then I may want 10 minutes more.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am willing for the gentleman to have an hour if he can show that this bill provides for the civil employees of the War Risk Bureau. I wish the gentleman, instead of making the assertion, would point out from the act where they are taken care of.

Mr. CANNON. I take it from the report there. Let that be as it may—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman knows the bill would settle it. The bill determines that point.

Mr. CANNON. Now, the gentleman wants to go back to the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is what we are trying to pass. We are not trying to pass the report.

Mr. CANNON. I read:

Additional hospital and sanatorium facilities for the care and treatment of discharged sick and disabled soldiers and sailors, patients of the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Patients.

Mr. CANNON. I read further:

And for others entitled to treatment by the Public Health Service.

Now, my motion is not to strike out the patients of the War Risk Bureau. That can follow later on. But it is for the Public Health Service and others. You enumerate here five or six cases where they are entitled to hospital treatment and then wind up and propose to legislate for all others that are entitled, and when you pass that you can still appropriate for expenditures for the others.

Now, what does "others" mean? Why, gentlemen who have watched the great progress that has been made during this administration, before the declaration of war and since the declaration of war, will find that the Treasury Department through the Public Health Service, by appropriations made by Congress, sometimes without legislation and sometimes with the legislation, has so greatly extended the power of the Public Health Service that there is not one citizen in a thousand in the United States that understands what has been done. For instance, there have been appropriations made to take care of epidemics; appropriations made to take care of venereal diseases. We spend great blocks of money to protect the soldiers in the cantonments, and then we are spending great blocks of money, without cooperation of the States and with the cooperation of the States, with which, from my best judgment, as near as I can ascertain in haste, you can take people afflicted with various diseases in civil life who require treatment in a hospital and put them in a hospital and treat them at the public expense. Does anybody dispute that? The gentleman is silent.

Now, I am not for it. I want every citizen, great and small, to stand with equal privilege before the law, and to care for our soldiers and sailors and their dependents as we have cared for them. Therefore I take it that this amendment ought to prevail.

Now, then, a word about the hospitals. I have read this report. I have been tolerably busy since this Congress met in the Committee on Appropriations, headed by Mr. SHERLEY, on a deficiency appropriation bill, a bill that has taken my time, almost every minute of it, from the commencement of this session up to the present moment. We have reported that bill, and I suppose it will follow this one. We will discuss it when we come to it. But I think it is the most important bill that has been or will be passed during this session of Congress.

Now, we got ready for this war in haste. There are 16 camps and 16 cantonments in the United States, on leased ground in the main. Wherever those camps and cantonments are all, as I understand it, are equipped with hospitals. A hospital means a place for the treatment of the sick and wounded, with all accommodations for the doctors and with all the accommodations for the nurses. Now, we are not needing those camps and cantonments much longer. We are not drafting people to send to them. But here is this property that Uncle Sam owns. To construct a hospital such as this bill contemplates, as near as I can tell from reading of the report, means \$3,000 a bed; that is, to make the bed available. And it would take from two to four years to construct a hospital as desired by the supporters of this bill.

Mr. BUTLER. How long? From two to four years?

Mr. CANNON. Yes. We discussed this a little bit when we had the Kentucky proposition before us for a hospital, as you will recollect.

Now, I want to say another thing, and with high respect, for I suppose I am as selfish as most Members of Congress, if not all Members of Congress, in caring for my constituency. But you may take Document No. 14 and Document No. 16 of these hearings, and you may read them all through, and you will find there that the anxiety about the location of the hospitals, the hearings about their location, was pretty near, you know, in interest to many members of that committee, interested in building hospitals in the back yards of their districts, or in their sections. I do not care where they are built, provided they are properly located and built, and provided that they ought to be built at all.

I believe this bill ought to be amended, instructing the War Department and the Navy Department to turn over all these camps and cantonments for use as hospitals for the people who are entitled to relief therein. We have over 100,000 beds, with 50,000 occupied, it is said. A fair reading of these hearings shows that the great mass of men who come back and are not well, but sick, are kept by the War Department until they get well, and then they are discharged. That appears in the hearing. I pause to have it contradicted. Is there any contradiction?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes. The gentleman makes the challenge, and I will accept it. I want to call his attention to the fact that, notwithstanding the statements of some of the officials of the War Department that they did not discharge men until they were cured, there were 24,500 tuberculosis cases in the Army that have been discharged, and they are discharging them to-day at the rate of 250 per week.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely; a number of months or weeks of treatment is given for tuberculosis cases. Great stress is laid upon tuberculosis treatment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I am going to ask, Mr. Chairman, for an additional five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Tuberculosis is a terrible disease, but from all the reading that I have been able to give to this hearing and everywhere else I find that there is a certain stage of tuberculosis that practically can not be cured, but there is an earlier stage of it where, with the great improvements in treatment, recoveries are had. What you want is not granite walls and air-tight compartments. That may be contradicted by somebody who will follow me, if he wants to. What we want is sunlight and air, fats and good healthy food to eat. That is the treatment, and about the only treatment, as I have been informed by skilled physicians; that is the only treatment that is proper for tuberculosis. This record shows that after a few months those that are curable are very apt to be discharged cured.

Now, then, suppose a man who has been in the Army contracts tuberculosis after he is discharged. Then he is treated by the doctor in his neighborhood at the expense of the United States. That is the scheme. Or he is treated in a hospital. I am not here to say that such treatment should be denied. We have been liberal with the soldiers. We were liberal with the soldiers of the Civil War. But I am here to say that I believe from these hearings and from this bill and from the legislation that has been had, even before the war commenced, extending the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service, coupled with what has happened since that time, the time has come to call a halt. Not in caring for the soldier, but in caring for the soldier taking care also for the civilian, playing favorites.

Now, I think that is all I want to say. I shall vote for the amendment which I have offered, because that amendment takes care not only of everybody who is entitled under the law to be cared for now, but as legislation may be enacted hereafter, it will take care of them without any further enactment.

I want to refer to the Public Health Service, and I do it respectfully. The head of that Public Health Service is one of the ablest men I have ever met. He is a thorough gentleman. But he is like all the balance of mankind, some stronger and some weaker. In that he tries to extend his jurisdiction and his work, and in many instances I think not for the public good.

Mr. RUCKER. Before the gentleman takes his seat, may I ask him a question?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman realizes, from what he knows historically about the war, that it is altogether probable that tuberculosis will develop in many cases after discharge when it is not present at the time of discharge?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. Those people, I believe you stated, ought to be treated by the Government?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; but I want to say one other thing: In the legislation that we had caring for the soldiers of the Civil War, they had to prove their injuries by official records.

Mr. RUCKER. That is, in order to get a pension?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; to get a pension. Or they had to prove it by witnesses; and they had to trace the present condition to the service in line of duty. Now, I do not want anything so severe as that for the soldiers of this war.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman will realize that injustice was done to thousands of men by reason of that harsh rule?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; I realize all that.

Mr. RUCKER. If a man, able and well, is accepted into the service and after the battle is discharged and suddenly afterwards develops tuberculosis, would not the gentleman agree that that man should be treated by the Government?

Mr. CANNON. I have already stated that I would have him treated by the Government.

Mr. RUCKER. I hope the gentleman will say it with his usual emphasis.

Mr. CANNON. I have already said that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] is glib of tongue and of great ability, and I want to compliment him on his ability. He comes with great strength, and he picks up this newspaper report about the Walter Reed Hospital, about the inmates there having to do their own laundry work, one-armed and one-legged men. Good God! The appropriations are available, and it is your administration as well as mine. You made it; I did not. I am not in party harmony with it. In many instances I have supported it. But instead of criticizing this or that or the other thing that can be remedied by administration, why do you not take some of these people by the nape of the neck and the slack of the breeches and throw them out of the public service? [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. I would be glad to do it if I could; but the gentleman has as much power to do it as I have, and I say therefore let us not give them any more power than they already have.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; you control. You have got the President; you have got the Congress. You control it; and while I am not lying awake at night to deny that it has been a difficult task, we helping you as best we could and not throwing chunks in the way, I think the rocks and mountains ought to fall on you, at least temporarily, and put you out of complete power and let us unscramble the eggs. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the splendid laudation of the head of the Public Health Service by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who has just taken his seat, I would like to call his attention and also the attention of the House to the letter of the head of the Public Health Service, Robert Blue, Surgeon General, which was printed in my remarks of Saturday. I want to refer specifically to this statement:

It has been stated that the policy of the Army is to keep its tuberculosis cases until they are incapable of further improvement. As a matter of fact, of the 1,724 war-risk cases now actually under treatment 930 are cases of tuberculosis which have been discharged from the Army.

Mr. STAFFORD. That statement is not at all inconsistent with the other.

Mr. GRIFFIN. And in order to rob this discussion of its uncertainty, particularly where figures are concerned, I want to call the attention of Members, who will take the time and pains to do so, to page 2056 of the RECORD of Saturday, which contains, not the statements or the inferences of men from these departments, given casually two months ago or one month ago, but the figures right up to January 17, 1919; and in the last report from the War Department you will find that their statement is that they have only 42,530 beds, and you will also find on that page a statement that there are 120,000 wounded men now under treatment in French, English, and American hospitals on the other side.

Now, coming specifically to this amendment, I want, with all due deference to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], to submit to his judgment this proposition—

Mr. TEMPLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. TEMPLE. On the page referred to the total number of men receiving treatment in French and British hospitals is stated to be 8,000, and the vacant beds 42,530.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman is reading from the wrong table.

Mr. TEMPLE. I am reading from the table on the page the gentleman referred to.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I call the gentleman's attention to Exhibit D, wherein it is stated that the total number of men receiving treatment in American hospitals in France, including the English and French hospitals, as reported from American Expeditionary Forces January 2, was 120,301.

Mr. TEMPLE. The total number that had received treatment all told?

Mr. GRIFFIN. The total number that were receiving treatment on that date. The gentleman is looking at the comparative table in Exhibit C, where the number of men receiving treatment in the various hospitals are compared as of November 28 and January 17. When the figures were differentiated the War Department showed that there were 8,000 men receiving treatment in English and French hospitals, and 182,569 receiving treatment in American hospitals.

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes; that is correct. The number not in American hospitals is stated at 8,000.

Mr. GRIFFIN. But as of January 2 there are 120,000 men receiving treatment in English, French, and American hospitals combined.

Mr. TEMPLE. With 42,000 vacant beds in American hospitals.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Over here; yes.

Mr. BUTLER. How many vacant beds in American hospitals?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Forty-two thousand.

Mr. KREIDER. And 15,000 more being completed.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Let me proceed.

Mr. KREIDER. Those men who are being treated are not all of them wounded. Some of them are sick.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is true.

Mr. KREIDER. And not 50 per cent of them will apply for treatment after they return to this country.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is merely an inference and a conjecture. If you are willing to draw conjectures of that kind against this bill and against the soldier, I ask you in all fairness to use your sane thought and vision, to infer that thousands of these boys who have been in the trenches and who come back here with their lungs sloughing away as the result of being gassed and as the result of other diseases are likely in the future to appeal to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance for relief; and we have the figures to show that 14,200 of them up to date have made application, and that these applications are coming in at the rate of 250 a day.

Mr. KREIDER. But those are not men who have returned from overseas.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Now, getting down to the specific amendment before the House, the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, I want to say, with all deference to him, that if that amendment were passed, it would take the vitals out of this law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. I suppose the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] is willing?

Mr. BURNETT. The gentleman from Florida is not here, and in his absence I ask it.

Mr. MANN. He is willing to have the time extended?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman will proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If this amendment were to pass and we were to cut out these lines on page 1, it would repeal every law that you have been enacting since 1798 putting responsibilities upon the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. How would it repeal the law to say, while providing additional hospital accommodations, that people already entitled to hospital accommodations should be entitled to these additional ones?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I will show the gentleman how it would effectually repeal the law.

Mr. MANN. It would take more than five minutes to show that.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Oh, no; have patience. It would have the effect to repeal, although not specifically repealing the existing

law, for this reason: That the Public Health Service is required to treat certain departments of the Government—for instance, the Coast Survey, the Geodetic Survey, and persons injured under the workmen's compensation act. Now, all of the other departments are to be excluded from the terms of this act, and we are asked to provide for additional facilities for the exclusive benefit of the soldier, the sailor, and the marine under the proposition in the gentleman's amendment. If this amendment were to be adopted, while nominally on its face it would prevent the additional facilities being used by any but soldiers and patients of the War Risk Insurance Bureau, it would have the effect of not only including them but it would vitiate all of our previous legislation on this subject. It would do that for the reason that the Public Health Service is now treating patients beyond its capacity; they have sent patients to outside hospitals, and they have not room to-day to treat the men who are wounded in the service. They have not the facilities. If gentlemen will look at Exhibit F, on page 2056, they will find that in 1918 the total patients treated were 12,797, and that the total patients treated in contract hospitals during 1918 were 7,812. Now, what do you want to do by the amendment? You say nobody shall have the benefit of the additional hospital facilities of the Public Health Service except the soldiers, sailors, and patients of the War Risk Bureau. What is going to become of those entitled by previous laws to treatment? Do you not see that if you emphasize the fact that it must be used by discharged sailors and soldiers you thereby exclude the other beneficiaries, and for that reason I hope this amendment will not prevail, because it would repeal prior laws?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Are there many soldiers and sailors that have taken no part in this war?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I do not know; this bill provides for soldiers and sailors, and that is the main purpose. We can better serve the interests of the sailors and soldiers and marines by giving the Public Health Service a little latitude. If you adopt this amendment, it is true you will prefer the soldiers, sailors, and marines, but you exclude all other people who are entitled to treatment under previous laws or you compel them to send their patients to a contract hospital, as they did in 1918.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I will.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I understood from the arguments made by the gentleman from New York and others in favor of the bill that there was immediate need for additional hospitals for discharged soldiers and sailors, and that the primary purpose of the appropriation here asked was to provide additional hospitals for such soldiers and sailors. The mere fact that you now limit the use to such soldiers and sailors would not in any sense work a repeal of an existing law authorizing the Public Health Service to provide hospital facilities for others, but would limit the use of the additional hospitals acquired hereunder to discharged sailors, soldiers, marines, and Army nurses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. MANN. That with the consent of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK]?

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman from Florida has stepped out, and it was understood that I was to answer the proposal of the gentleman from Illinois, and I am trying to do it the best I can, if I only get a chance.

Mr. BURNETT. The gentleman from New York is asking the consent of the House and not the consent of the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MANN. No; but the gentleman from Florida gave notice that he would object to any requests for unanimous consent to extend the time after my colleague had finished his speech. I just wanted to know the attitude of that side of the House. I do not want an objection made when some one asks to extend the time on this side and then be absent when some one wants an extension on that side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. LEVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the debate has gone along wearily. There is an appropriation bill ready for consideration, and while I would not object, of course it does seem to me that the members of the committee ought to try to make some progress on this bill, so that appropriation bills can be considered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, the question has been asked by the gentleman from Alabama whether or not this bill is exclusively intended for soldiers and sailors and the marines. I

answer emphatically that it is, but the lines which were put in this bill by the framer, namely, "for others entitled to treatment by the Public Health Service," were put in there as a protection—to prevent the other beneficiaries of the Public Health Service from being crowded out. In other words, I want to make it plain that we are providing additional facilities for the soldiers and sailors and marines, and also in providing those facilities we do not want to shove the other fellows out who by prior laws are entitled to the benefit of treatment by the Public Health Service.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Surely.

Mr. CANNON. It seems to me the gentleman can not find any other Member of the House on either side that would agree to the statement the gentleman has just made. He says this gives preference to soldiers and sailors. There is nothing in the bill that shows that it gives any preference.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I said it was the intention of the framers to give preference to the soldiers and sailors and marines; but, exercising the proper foresight and intelligence, the bill drafter provided by this law that we should exclude no one entitled by prior laws to the consideration of the Public Health Service. Mr. Chairman, the committee is opposed to this amendment, and I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. This information may have been given before, but I have been out of the House on business. Take the case of a man called by the county board sent to some camp and after staying there two weeks it is ascertained by the medical examination at the camp that he had some disease which rendered him incapable of rendering military service and he is sent home. Would such an individual be a beneficiary under this bill?

Mr. GRIFFIN. He would be. He would be entitled to treatment, because the Government assumed authority over him when he was taken by the local board and was considered in good health. The mere fact that there are a few thousand men in that category, and only a few thousand, should not blind us to the fact that there are 1,167,574 volunteers who are entitled to treatment under this act. Furthermore, there are 2,818,000 drafted men who passed the local boards and the Army surgeons, who were inducted into the service, many of them going across the sea—more than 4,000,000 altogether—who will be entitled to treatment under this law.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I do.

Mr. RUCKER. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I can not agree with the answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] has just given to the question propounded by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS]. I think in the case he stated the soldiers referred to would not be entitled to the benefits of this provision, for the reason that the law to which the gentleman evidently had reference provides that all soldiers who were examined, accepted, and enrolled shall be the beneficiaries, not merely those who were inducted into the camps by the district board.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MANN rose.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, how much time does the gentleman from Illinois desire?

Mr. MANN. Five minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Then I move that at the expiration of five minutes all debate shall close upon this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida moves that after the expiration of five minutes all debate on the amendment be closed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the bill is primarily for the purpose of providing hospital accommodations for the men in the military and naval services who have been discharged from the service. We want to take care of them. We want to provide additional accommodations for them, but we want to know that they receive the benefit of what we do. The bill goes further than that. It provides for the accommodation of all others entitled to treatment by the Public Health Service. Some gentlemen stated on the floor to-day that there were 50,000 of those. I do not know how many there are. Nobody knows. The present accommodations of the Public Health Service, the old marine hospitals, are fairly well taking care of those now committed to the Public Health Service for treatment outside of the discharged soldiers and sailors. There is no demand upon the part of the country, there is no need so far as appropriations are concerned, for us now to make special provisions for the others

already provided for. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] said that to agree to the amendment of my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to strike out this language would be to repeal existing law. That is solely erroneous. There is no repeal of existing law. Those people now entitled to the Public Health Service in the present hospitals, or under contract, would still be entitled to treatment in the same way, but they will not be entitled to preference over the boys discharged from our Army and Navy in these new hospitals. We want to give the boys the preference in the new hospitals. I do not want to provide additional accommodations here for the discharged soldiers and sailors, and then find they are crowded out by somebody from the merchant marines who claims he is ill, or by somebody whom they are entitled now to treat, somewhere in the country, either in the cities or in the rural districts. Let us say emphatically to the boys who are coming home, "We will provide for you by these additional accommodations in the hospitals, and we will see to it that you get the benefit of them." [Applause.] Let us do that instead of providing, through a subterfuge, additional hospitals so that somebody else may get the benefit of them and possibly crowd out these soldiers.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I have only five minutes, and the gentleman must make his question short.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman knows, of course, that all these other people are now provided by law to be taken care of?

Mr. MANN. That is not a question. I have just stated that.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Would the gentleman object to treating these people in case the soldiers and sailors are taken care of and then some beds are left over?

Mr. MANN. There is present capacity for these other people. When we have these hospitals in operation and we have spare beds in them, Congress will still be in existence, and it then can provide, if necessary, that the extra beds may be used by the civil patients. Give these boys the first chance. Do not let the Public Health Service use us, through a demand for the treatment of our returned soldiers, to get additional accommodations which they would like to have at all times, but the need for which they have not yet been able to impress upon the minds of Congress. Give the boys a chance. Strike that language out, and if this bill becomes a law, as I hope it will if the language goes out, the boys will have the beds in these hospitals.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. After the word "service," in line 8, insert:

Provided, That discharged, sick, and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines, and Army and Navy nurses, male and female, shall first be provided for.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that amendment is not in order. It is not a substitute. It has no relation to the text in the bill which it is proposed to strike out. Such an amendment could be offered if the language does not go out, but it is not germane now.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It seems to me that it is entirely germane and in order, because it is an effort to perfect the bill in the respect of which the gentleman complained, and surely the gentleman meant what he did?

Mr. MANN. Surely, and if this language stays in the bill, I would like to see the gentleman's amendment adopted.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That would meet his objection and take care of the soldiers and sailors. That was the intention of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, this debate—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am discussing the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Very well; I am willing to talk about the point of order all afternoon.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am trying to show why it is germane. The intention of the bill was to take care of these people first, and in case there were more beds than they needed, why not let the other beneficiaries of the laws which we have passed from year to year get the benefit of them. There are over 7,000 of them right now in contract hospitals.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. Section 5790 of Hinds' Precedents provides—

To a motion to insert words in a bill, a motion to strike out certain words of the bill may not be offered as a substitute.

The rule vice versa also is considered to be good. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken and sustains it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I give notice if this amendment be voted down—

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order again.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate is exhausted, and the question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division. The committee proceeded to divide.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Mr. MANN. Let us see whether it is necessary or not.

The question was taken, and tellers were refused.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that while the vote indicated what the result might be in point of fact the noes have never been counted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes the gentleman is correct. All those in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] The ayes are 65. Those opposed will rise. [After counting.] The noes are 22. Upon this vote the ayes are 65 and the noes are 22.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I think I shall ask the committee to rise and rerefer this bill to the committee. There seems to be a disposition not to make any hospital provision, so I do not think it is necessary to proceed with the bill.

Mr. MANN. I do not think that would be a wise thing to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make that motion?

Mr. WALSH. Regular order!

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded. There are no amendments pending, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury, in securing additional sites herein provided for, may request the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Agriculture, or the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the Treasury Department such lands or parts of land under their control, not required for other purposes, as may be found suitable for this use, and they are hereby authorized to make such transfer as may be in the interest of the Government.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Strike out the paragraph beginning in line 18 and ending in line 25, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The Secretary of the Treasury, in securing additional sites, buildings, fixtures, appliances, furnishings, or furniture herein provided for, may request the President, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary of Labor to transfer to the Treasury Department such lands or parts of land, buildings, fixtures, appliances, furnishings, or furniture under their control, not required for other purposes, as may be found suitable for this use, and they are hereby authorized to make such transfer as may be in the interest of the Government: *Provided*, That nothing shall be expended out of the amounts authorized by this act until all buildings, grounds, furniture, and furnishings available for hospital purposes not needed by the said departments or officers of the Government heretofore mentioned have been turned over to the Secretary of the Treasury."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 3, after the words "herein provided for," strike out the word "may" and insert in lieu thereof the word "shall."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The committee accepts that amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I submit the vote ought to be put on the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I submit that we have a right to offer a further amendment to the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The amendment which was adopted was an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to the committee amendment. The committee amendment itself has not been adopted.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GANDY. I want to inquire whether or not, this being a further amendment to the committee amendment, it ought not to be heard and considered before the vote is taken on the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the Chair thought the objection was raised that it could not be offered at this time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Not at all; any amendment to the amendment is in order.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 10, after the word "authorized," insert the words "and directed."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That amendment is acceptable to the committee.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 16, add the following to the paragraph:

"*Provided further*, That when the Secretary of the Treasury shall not have further need of such lands or parts of land, buildings, fixtures, appliances, furnishings, or furniture so transferred, he shall cause the same to be returned to the jurisdiction or control of the department or officer of the Government by whom such transfer was made."

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GANDY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Suppose the War Department turns over a building to the Public Health Service which it uses for a good while. What is the object when the Public Health Service gets through with it of requiring that service to turn back to the War Department the buildings, all surgical appliances, and everything else they have with it? Why could not the Public Health Service, the Treasury Department, dispose of it just as well as the War Department?

Mr. GANDY. I want to say this to the gentleman who raises the question. My thought is that there are many places where the War Department, and perhaps other departments, have both lands and buildings that for occupancy for a time they might not have objection to transferring jurisdiction and control to the Treasury Department if they knew under the language of this bill after the Treasury Department gets through with it that they would get the property back. I have no thought that any land will be transferred or any buildings will be transferred under this provision as it now is. I have in mind a military post that has not been in use for some number of years, where there are accommodations for a large number, where every building is either steam heated or furnace heated, where there is hot and cold water in every building, where every building, unless it be two or three, are either of brick or stone construction. Now, it is entirely possible that under the provision of this amendment, where a transfer of property is authorized, that to meet this emergency the War Department might consent to permit a post of that kind to be used by the Treasury Department, but I do not believe that department would turn it over unconditionally.

Mr. MANN. I can see the point of the gentleman's provision, but how would it be where the War Department now has a hospital rented and wished to turn over the rented hospital to the Public Health Service? At the end of the term absolutely, under the gentleman's amendment, they would be required to do an impossible thing, maybe, that would be sufficient to turn it back to the War Department.

Mr. GANDY. I take it that under the provisions of this bill that on leased property the War Department, inasmuch as these leases are subject to cancellation on very short notice, would simply cancel its lease and the Treasury Department take a lease in its own name. I have not any thought that they are going to transfer leased property from one department to another. But there is a lot of property that the departments of the Government own and do not use.

Mr. MANN. It may very probably happen. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. GANDY].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be adopted, because it is absolutely unnecessary. I do not think we ought to try to legislate here and go through all the ramifications of the years to see what shall be done with this property. If the property is turned over by the Treasury Department to the Public Health Service and the time comes when there is no longer any need for it, the matter is in the hands of Congress, and they can direct that it be turned back if they so desire. There will be no trouble there at all, and I can not see what earthly use the amendment will be.

Mr. NOLAN. If the gentleman will permit, I do not know as I understand what the amendment is. It seems that the Public Health Service is going to become one of the most important adjuncts in connection with our Federal service. They have been given jurisdiction over marine hospitals. If we are going to have a merchant marine, we are going to have need for increased marine hospital service, and the Public Health Service will have its activities largely increased. I do not know whether I clearly understand the gentleman's amendment or not. Is it mandatory that the Public Health Service, provided the War Department needs certain buildings, certain grounds, certain lands, shall return them to the War Department or to the Navy Department, and that, in addition to returning the property, they return appliances?

Mr. GANDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NOLAN. I am asking that question.

Mr. GANDY. The language of this committee amendment provides that various governmental departments may turn over buildings and grounds available.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It provides now that they shall turn them over.

Mr. GANDY. If they do not need them. Under the language of the amendment I have offered, it simply provides that when the Treasury Department no longer needs it, the property turned over shall be turned back.

Mr. NOLAN. Is the language of the gentleman's amendment clear enough so that it will be understood that when they are not any longer needed they shall be turned back?

Mr. GANDY. It so states.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. GANDY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREEN of Iowa: Page 3, line 16, after the word "Treasury," strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and add the following: "and for the purpose of determining the needs of the War Department, the Surgeon General shall, on the first day of each month after the passage of this act, file with the Secretary of War a detailed statement showing the needs of the War Department for hospital purposes, having regard to the number of soldiers needing hospital treatment who may be expected to be returned from abroad."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that amendment as not being germane to the amendment offered or to the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not believe I hardly need argue that, Mr. Chairman. It is certainly germane. It explains the application of the committee amendment and specifies the manner in which it shall be applied.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will address himself to the point of order.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I prefer, if I may be permitted, to reply to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it is very simple to me. I am not a parliamentary expert and do not make any claims in that direction. But here is a bill dealing distinctly with discharged soldiers and sailors, over whom the War Department has no possible jurisdiction. Now, here is an amendment offered requiring the Secretary of War to make certain reports about the hospitals needed, and all that kind of thing, by the War Department. Now, right upon its face it appears to me absolutely not germane to this bill. I shall not discuss it any further.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly obvious, in the first place, that this committee amendment provides that certain hospitals not needed by the War Department shall be turned over to the Bureau of Public Health, and it provides further that these sums shall not be expended until this provision has been complied with. Now, I add right to the sentence that contains that provision with reference to the turning over of these buildings the further provision that there shall be a method provided whereby we can determine what those needs are, and determine whether the War Department is carrying out in good faith the provisions of the committee amendment. It relates solely to the subject of the committee amendment, and is simply a method of determining what these things are which are referred to in the committee amendment. As the matter stands now, there is no way of determining whether the War Department complies with the provision or not. It says that property not needed shall be turned over to the Bureau of Public Health. The only way to find out what is not needed is to get a statement of its needs. My amendment provides a method of obtaining this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Florida, but the Chair is in doubt about the ruling. It seems to me that this bill is applicable to discharged soldiers and sailors, marines and nurses.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. And that the amendment of the gentleman seeks for a general report from the Secretary of War as to hospitals of all kinds and classes, to be made annually, which goes outside of the purpose of this bill and, it seems to the Chair, beyond it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, if the Chair will notice, that has got to be determined by the War Department. The sole question is whether it will express this determination in writing where somebody will find it, or whether it will be found in the mind of some War Department official.

The CHAIRMAN. But does not the gentleman's amendment apply not only to those hospitals provided for by this bill but to all hospitals controlled by the War Department?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; and so does the bill refer to other hospitals. It says "Those buildings that are not needed for other purposes."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman's amendment simply applied to all these hospitals that the Secretary of War may turn over under this bill, it might be germane; but it certainly is not germane when he wants to have made this exhaustive report as to all hospitals under their control. This bill does not deal with the War Department. It does not deal with soldiers and sailors.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman claim that it does not deal with the War Department, when it expressly requires the War Department to turn over those hospitals?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. So is the Navy Department, and so is the Department of Labor and the Interior Department, and practically every other department of the Government. You might offer amendments here until doomsday, asking all those people to make reports about the operations of their departments.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That would not have anything to do with the question of whether the amendment was in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is uncertain.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The purpose of this bill, Mr. Chairman, is that the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers and sailors. The amendment calls upon the War Department to furnish information as to the universal needs of the War Department.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes. That is one thing that has got to be determined by the Secretary of War before he turns over these buildings under the terms of the bill. If he needs the property for other purposes, he is not required to turn it over.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Where is that?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. On page 3, line 8. He says they shall turn over what "is not required for other purposes."

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. But this is not limited to information in that connection. It directs universal information to be furnished with respect to the needs of the War Department.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No. It limits it to hospital purposes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That is the wording of the amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I wish the gentleman had noticed the reading of the amendment more carefully. It refers to the needs of the War Department for hospital purposes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I will ask for the reading of the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The amendment provides for information concerning the needs of the War Department.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I ask that the amendment in this connection be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will again be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREEN of Iowa: Page 3, line 16, after the word "Treasury," strike out the period, insert in lieu thereof a comma, and add the following: "and for the purpose of determining the needs of the War Department the Surgeon General shall on the first day of each month after the passage of this act file with the Secretary of War a detailed statement showing the needs of the War Department for hospital purposes, having regard to the number of soldiers needing hospital treatment who may be expected to be returned from abroad."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I will not take up further the time of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the paragraph of the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Is that an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Let us get through with this amendment first.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will withdraw that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on the amendment has been exhausted.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. There is no last word. I suggest that the gentleman wait until the next paragraph.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I want to speak on this amendment. Mr. CLARK of Florida. But the amendment is disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's motion ought to come on the next section read.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I want to speak on this amendment, if the Chair please.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I rose before the Chair put the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate was then exhausted on that amendment, and there was nothing of the amendment then before the House.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Then I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I object. I would like to have the next paragraph read.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment as a new paragraph, following the amendment just adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BANKHEAD: After line 16, on page 3, add a new paragraph, as follows:

"Where classes giving instruction to disabled soldiers and sailors are maintained by the Federal Board for Vocational Education under the vocational rehabilitation act at any hospital or sanatorium under the jurisdiction of the United States Public Health Service, the said board is authorized and instructed to admit to such classes all patients at such hospital or sanatorium who are employees in the public service of the United States."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. May I inquire of the gentleman what is the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not germane to the bill under consideration.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Chair is in doubt about that, I would like to be heard on it briefly.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I very frankly admit that this amendment possibly does not cover the same field of operation that it would have covered in the event that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] had been defeated. But in spite of the action of the committee in adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], I think there is a field of operation still left within the bill for the proper application of the subject matter of the proposed amendment. It has been admitted here in this argument that these existing institutions, already provided for by law, for the purpose of enabling the Public Health Service to take care of patients in the public service, will not be abolished or abrogated by this proposed legislation. In other words, Mr. Chairman, if the bill passes in its present form, as now amended up to this stage, it will still be necessary to operate a number of these sanatoriums by the Public Health Service for the purpose of taking care of patients under existing law. There is nothing in this bill, and there is nothing in any provision of it up to this date adopted, that prohibits caring for discharged soldiers and sailors and these other civil employees in the same institution. As a matter of fact and as a matter of practical operation, I have no doubt that some of these general hospitals—I believe four in number—now run by the Public Health Service will have as their patients and inmates not only discharged soldiers and sailors, but some of these men coming under these various classes contained in this report, civil employees, whom it is the duty of the Public Health Service to care for and treat. The language and purpose of the bill is that the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to provide immediate additional hospital and sanatorium facilities for the care and treatment of discharged and disabled soldiers and sailors, patients of the War Risk Insurance Bureau, and so forth. Now, it certainly is an element of treatment, it is an element of care, as admitted by all known authorities on this subject, to include this proposed training and teaching.

Vocational rehabilitation while in the hospital is regarded as of high value in the therapeutic treatment and functional restoration to health of the patient. The general purpose of this bill is for the care and treatment of the inmates of those hospitals, and the vocational board has already made arrangements and has already instituted classes in different sanatoriums for the purpose of giving vocational training to all in them, but it has no authority of law to give vocational training to these people who are in the hospitals as public employees. I offer this amendment at the earnest request of the Director of the Board for Federal Vocational Education, in order that those men who are still in these hospitals along with soldiers and sailors may have authority of law to take advantage of these vocational classes. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, in view of the general objects of this bill, that it is a regulation that would be germane to the general purposes of this bill, as a part of care and treatment, and is not of an exclusive nature.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair thinks the amendment is not germane to the general purposes of this bill, but that it is along another and an additional line. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, in this connection, the letter and memorandum of Dr. Prosser on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter and memorandum referred to are as follows:

FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
Washington, December 23, 1918.

Hon. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BANKHEAD: Herewith I send you copy of the proposed amendment to House bill No. 13026, admitting civilian employees of the United States to the benefits of vocational training for tubercular soldiers and sailors located at the same sanatoria. An explanatory memorandum with regard to the same is attached. I understand that this House bill has been reported favorably from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, of which Mr. CLARK of Florida is chairman.

It is being sent you with the hope that you may be able to attach it to the bill. Possibly Mr. CLARK may be willing to accept it for his committee. The amendment and proposal has the hearty support not only of the Federal board but of the War Risk Insurance Bureau and the Surgeon General for Public Health.

Thanking you for your help in this matter, I remain,

Cordially, yours,

C. A. PROSSER, Director.

1. From figures already available it is abundantly evident that the largest single disability from which men may suffer after discharge from the military or navy forces is tuberculosis of the lungs and chest. As a large number of men suffering from this disability will be subjects for vocational training and placement under the vocational rehabilitation act the Federal board is paying special attention to the problems involved.

2. By an arrangement jointly with the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and the United States Public Health Service, the Federal board has agreed to undertake the provision of vocational training for all discharged soldiers and sailors sent by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance to the tuberculosis sanatoria conducted by the United States Public Health Service for the purpose of receiving treatment.

3. The purpose of this training is threefold:

(a) In the opinion of the medical authorities, to whose direction, of course, it will always be subject, it has a very definite therapeutic value.

(b) It will prevent the restlessness and constant desire to give up treatment or to be transferred to some other sanatorium, which is such a well-known characteristic of the sufferer from tuberculosis.

(c) In a great many cases it will have a definite vocational value to the man when his disease is arrested and he leaves the sanatorium, either to return to his civilian occupation or to take more specialized vocational training under the vocational rehabilitation act.

4. Inasmuch as there will be many employees of the public service of the United States receiving treatment in the same institutions in which the Federal board will, under the arrangements with the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and the United States Public Health Service, provide vocational training for discharged disabled soldiers and sailors, it seems eminently desirable that any training classes which are provided for the training of discharged soldiers and sailors should also be open to the other patients in the institution. This would be done without any increased cost to the Government, as the classes already operated would be small and civilian employees could be admitted with practically no additional expenditure.

5. The suggested amendment to House bill No. 13026, making an appropriation for the erection of hospital sanatoria under the Public Health Service, would make provision for such vocational training for such civilian employees of the United States Government. See attached amendment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, there is a committee amendment at the desk that applies to this paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand the committee proposes a substitute for lines 17 to 25 on page 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will first read the paragraph of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

In carrying the foregoing authorization into effect the Secretary of the Treasury may enter into contracts for the lease or purchase of existing buildings, grounds, and equipment, or may enter into con-

tracts for the construction, equipment, etc., of such buildings, or purchase materials and labor in open market, or otherwise, and employ laborers and mechanics for the construction of such buildings and their equipment as in his judgment shall best meet the public exigencies, within the limits of this authorization.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Now let the Clerk read the proposed amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 3, lines 17 to 25, inclusive, strike out all and insert as follows:

"In carrying the foregoing authorization into effect the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to contract with any existing hospital or sanatorium, by lease or otherwise, for the immediate use, in whole or in part, of their present facilities. He may enter into contracts for the lease or purchase of additions to such existing buildings, grounds, and equipment, and may enter into contracts for the construction, equipment, etc., of such buildings. He may purchase materials and labor in the open market, or otherwise, and employ laborers and mechanics for the construction of such buildings and their equipment as in his judgment shall best meet the public exigencies, within the limits of this authorization."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out of the substitute offered by the committee the last sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STAFFORD moves to amend the committee amendment by striking out the last sentence thereof, which reads as follows:

"He may purchase materials and labor in the open market, or otherwise, and employ laborers and mechanics for the construction of such buildings and their equipment as in his judgment shall best meet the public exigencies, within the limits of this authorization."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the war-time conditions which justified the vesting of great authority in the various executive officers to construct buildings, by hiring labor and purchasing material, have passed. Any person at all acquainted even slightly with the conditions of the building trade of the country knows that contractors are only too willing to take contracts for the erection of any kind of public buildings. The exigency has passed. Prices of materials are falling; labor is plentiful, and now when everyone admits that the exigency has passed, why should we grant this authority that was never thought proper to be conferred before the war? I think it is merely a lapse on the part of the members of the committee in drafting language to meet conditions which existed during the war.

I think the House will recognize the need of allowing the contract method to continue. The law prescribes the method for contracting additional buildings. It is agreed generally that there are plenty of contractors willing to do the work, and why is there need now of authorizing the Government to purchase material, contract for labor, and do the work on its own responsibility? We all know that that method is tremendously more expensive than the contract method. Why should we indulge in it when there are plenty of contractors willing to undertake the erection of buildings?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman will pardon me, I want to say this in reply to the gentleman from Wisconsin: This question has been raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin on other bills. It does not confine the department to the buying of material and hiring labor, but it will allow it a broad opening and either let it by contract or, if the contractors are holding up the Government, they can go into the open market, buy materials, and build it itself. It seems to me it is a mighty good thing to go into all public building bills and allow the Government leeway to know that it can not be held up by the conspiracy of builders. Let the Government go into the open market and buy the materials and hire the labor and put up the buildings. They can do it or they can advertise and let it to the lowest bidder. It simply leaves it open for these officials of the Government to do what is best for the Government. I hope the amendment to the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Would not your amendment authorize all this money to be expended for the construction of buildings on leased land?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. What is there in the amendment that would restrict the Secretary of the Treasury from constructing buildings on leased land? He could use every dollar of it in erecting buildings on land of some one else. Will the gentleman accept an amendment to read this way, "Provided, That no part of this appropriation can be expended in contract buildings on leased land"?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman will show me why that is needed, I will; but what is the use of accepting an amendment if there is no need of it.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman's amendment reads:

In carrying the foregoing authorization into effect the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to contract with any existing hospital or sanatorium, by lease or otherwise, for the immediate use, in whole or in part, of their present facilities. He may enter into contracts for the lease or purchase of additions to such existing buildings, grounds, and equipment and may enter into contracts for the construction, equipment, etc., of such buildings.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That does not say that he may construct the buildings on leased land.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; it gives him authority to take over the leased land and construct buildings, and there is nothing to prevent his spending the money of that purpose.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman certainly does not believe that the Secretary of the Treasury would spend millions of dollars to construct buildings on other people's land when he has no authority in the act itself.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. You conferred that authority upon him here.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. This is the authority conferred upon him:

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to contract with any existing hospital or sanatorium, by lease or otherwise, for the immediate use, in whole or in part, of their present facilities. He may enter into contracts for the lease or purchase of additions to such existing buildings, grounds, and equipment, and may enter into contracts for the construction, equipment, and so forth, of such buildings. He may purchase materials and labor in the open market, or otherwise, and employ laborers and mechanics for the construction of such buildings and their equipment as in his judgment shall best meet the public exigencies, within the limits of this authorization.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That confers on him the authority to lease or purchase.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. We provide for those that he may lease, and then we say he may enter into contract to construct hospital buildings. It can not mean anything else.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. What is the date of the introduction of this bill? It was introduced during the war time, was it not?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; the bill was introduced in war time, and it is war time now.

Mr. CANNON. Not so badly in war time that we can not go back to the construction under the statutes by contract.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. What does the gentleman mean to infer?

Mr. CANNON. I mean the activities of war are not upon us.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Certainly; we recognize that. We are trying to provide for peace times and not for war times.

Mr. CANNON. Does the Government hire hands and buy materials and construct buildings in peace times?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It is to be hoped that we learned something in the war, and if we did learn anything we ought to leave something in the hands of the Government, in their discretion, so that they would not be the victims of a conspiracy between the contractors.

Mr. CANNON. Conspiracy is always prohibited.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is all right; but the gentleman knows and we know that when buildings are advertised for that frequently the contractors will get together and arrange for bids which are all understood, and so hold up the Government. I do not say that just such a condition as that exists all of the time; but when it does and the Secretary suspects it, he ought to have the right to go out into the open market.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there anything in existing law that compels the Secretary to award a contract when he suspects there is a combination to raise prices?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, no; but what can he do? He can readvertise, can he not?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I do not think we should be too technical about the manner of constructing these buildings. I think the main thing is to have them in case of necessity, and there is not a man in the House who does not want ample provision made for treatment. We are all in favor of plenty of hospitals and good service for the men in the Army who return and need hospital treatment. I was not in favor of this bill as originally drawn. I listened to the testimony very carefully before the Public Buildings Committee, and I will say to you that I was not impressed by the testimony, for the reason that the expenditure was large and I thought we had sufficient hospitals already constructed, with 90,000 vacant beds, to provide for this service.

I know that there is not a better cantonment within the confines of the Republic than there is at Battle Creek, Mich. It is steam heated, and the buildings are suitable for this purpose. They are constructed on a high elevation, on the border of a small lake, with fine nurses and eminent physicians. I wish also to say a word of commendation for the splendid commandant, Maj. Gen. Hutcheson, now in charge of Camp Custer. He went through this last "flu" epidemic with the smallest loss in soldiers of any cantonment in the United States, save possibly one or two. It has a capacity of over 2,000 beds, with all equipment awaiting and ready for 1,500 patients. But after the hearing had on this bill it was amended, and I think the amendment makes it unobjectionable to anyone in this House. The following is the proviso referred to, found on page 3 of the bill:

Provided, That nothing shall be expended out of the amounts authorized by this act until all buildings, grounds, furniture, and furnishings available for hospital purposes not needed by the said departments or officers of the Government hereinbefore mentioned have been turned over to the Secretary of the Treasury.

None of this appropriation can be expended until all of the vacancies and the facilities for hospital purposes are turned over to the Secretary of the Treasury for hospital purposes. When that is done, where is there a man who will deny to a man in the United States wearing the uniform of his country, sick, wounded, or afflicted, the facilities of this hospital treatment? I say this bill ought to pass. They can remodel these hospitals and cantonments under this provision. We were then met with the fact that these cantonment buildings were not fireproof. Well, as to that fact, out here at Walter Reed Hospital, one of the best in the country, they are not fireproof. What this department wants is sufficient means at hand to meet the emergency when it arises, and under this bill they can construct hospitals when they are needed and not until then. Therefore I think the bill should pass. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer to the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment already pending.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. This is to perfect that amendment. I move to amend by inserting after the word "buildings" the words "on land owned by the Government."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment would be in the third degree.

Mr. MANN. There is already an amendment pending to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STAFFORD) there were—ayes 13, noes 32.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I now move to amend by adding, after the word "buildings," in line 8, the words "on Government-owned land."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we will accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk reported the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARDY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13026, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida demands the yeas and nays. All in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted.

Mr. CLARK of Florida (interrupting the count). Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 272, nays 7, answered "present" 3, not voting 147, as follows:

YEAS—272.

Alexander	Ellsworth	Kraus	Rodenberg
Almon	Elston	Kreider	Rogers
Anderson	Esch	Lampert	Romjue
Anthony	Evans	Langley	Rose
Ashbrook	Fairchild, B. L.	Larsen	Rouse
Aswell	Fairfield	Lazaro	Rubey
Bacharach	Farr	Lea, Cal.	Rucker
Baer	Ferris	Lee, Ga.	Sanders, Ind.
Bankhead	Fess	Lehlbach	Sanders, N. Y.
Barkley	Fisher	Lever	Schall
Beakes	Foss	Linthicum	Scott, Iowa
Bell	Poster	Littlepage	Scott, Mich.
Beshlin	Frear	Loneragan	Sells
Birch	French	Longworth	Sherwood
Black	Fuller, Ill.	Lufkin	Sims
Blackmon	Gallagher	Lundeen	Sinnot
Bland, Ind.	Gallivan	Lunn	Slomp
Bland, Va.	Gandy	McArthur	Sloan
Blanton	Gard	McClintic	Smith, Idaho
Bowers	Garland	McCulloch	Smith, Mich.
Brand	Garner	McFadden	Snell
Brodbeck	Garrett, Tenn.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Snook
Buchanan	Garrett, Tex.	McLemore	Snyder
Burnett	Gillett	Madden	Stegall
Burroughs	Glynn	Magee	Stedman
Butler	Godwin, N. C.	Mann	Steele
Byrnes, S. C.	Goodwin, Ark.	Mansfield	Steenerson
Byrns, Tenn.	Graham, Ill.	Mapes	Stevenson
Campbell, Kans.	Gray, Ala.	Martin	Summers
Campbell, Pa.	Green, Iowa	Mays	Sweet
Candler, Miss.	Greene, Mass.	Merritt	Swift
Cannon	Griffin	Miller, Minn.	Switzer
Cantrill	Hadley	Miller, Wash.	Taylor, Colo.
Carlin	Hamilton, Mich.	Montague	Temple
Carter, Okla.	Haslin	Moon	Thompson
Clark, Fla.	Hardy	Moore, Ind.	Tilman
Clark, Pa.	Harrison, Miss.	Morgan	Timberlake
Classon	Hastings	Mott	Towner
Claypool	Haugen	Nelson, A. P.	Treadway
Coady	Hayden	Nelson, J. M.	Van Dyke
Collier	Heflin	Nichols, Mich.	Vare
Connally, Tex.	Hensley	Nolan	Venable
Connely, Kans.	Hersey	Oldfield	Vestal
Cooper, W. Va.	Hicks	Oliver, Ala.	Vinson
Copley	Hilliard	Oliver, N. Y.	Volstead
Cramton	Holland	Olney	Walton
Crisp	Hollingsworth	Osborne	Ward
Crosser	Houston	O'Shaunessy	Wason
Currie, Mich.	Howard	Overstreet	Watkins
Curry, Cal.	Huddleston	Padgett	Watson, Va.
Dale	Hull, Iowa	Palge	Weaver
Dallinger	Hull, Tenn.	Peters	Webb
Darrow	Igoe	Phelan	Welling
Decker	Jacoway	Platt	Wheeler
Dempsey	James	Polk	White, Me.
Denison	Johnson, Ky.	Pou	Williams
Dickinson	Jones	Purnell	Wilson, Ill.
Dill	Juul	Quin	Wilson, La.
Dillon	Kearns	Ragsdale	Wilson, Tex.
Domink	Keating	Rainey, J. W.	Wingo
Doolittle	Kehoe	Raker	Winslow
Doremus	Kelley, Mich.	Ramsey	Wise
Doughton	Kelly, Pa.	Ramseyer	Wood, Ind.
Dowell	Kless, Pa.	Randall	Woodyard
Dupré	Kincheloe	Rayburn	Wright
Eagan	King	Reavis	Young, N. Dak.
Eagle	Kinkaid	Reed	Young, Tex.
	Knutson	Robinson	Zihlman

NAYS—7.

Dyer	Johnson, S. Dak.	La Follette	Rankin
Elliott	Johnson, Wash.	La Guardia	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Caraway	Moore, Pa.	Sisson
---------	------------	--------

NOT VOTING—147.

Austin	Cooper, Wis.	Estopinal	Hamill
Ayres	Costello	Fairchild, G. W.	Hamilton, N. Y.
Barnhart	Cox	Felds	Harrison, Va.
Benson	Crago	Flood	Haskell
Booher	Davey	Flynn	Hawley
Borland	Delaney	Focht	Hayes
Britten	Dent	Fordney	Heaton
Browne	Denton	Francis	Helntz
Browning	Dewalt	Freeman	Helm
Brumbaugh	Dies	Fuller, Mass.	Helvering
Caldwell	Dixon	Good	Hood
Carew	Donovan	Goodall	Humphreys
Carter, Mass.	Doolling	Gordon	Husted
Cary	Drane	Gould	Hutchinson
Chandler, N. Y.	Drukker	Graham, Pa.	Ireland
Chandler, Okla.	Dunn	Gray, N. J.	Kahn
Church	Edmonds	Greene, Vt.	Kennedy, Iowa
Cleary	Emerson	Gregg	Kennedy, R. I.
Cooper, Ohio	Essen	Griest	Kettner

Key, Ohio.	Nicholls, S. C.	Sanford	Strong
Kitchin	Norton	Saunders, Va.	Sullivan
Leshner	Overmyer	Scully	Tague
Little	Park	Sears	Taylor, Ark.
Lobeck	Parker, N. J.	Shackleford	Templeton
London	Parker, N. Y.	Shallenberger	Thomas
McAndrews	Porter	Sherley	Tilson
McCormick	Powers	Shouse	Tinkham
McKenzie	Pratt	Siegel	Voigt
McKeown	Price	Slayden	Waldow
McKinney	Rainey, H. T.	Small	Walker
McLaughlin, Pa.	Riordan	Smith, C. B.	Walsh
Maher	Roberts	Smith, T. F.	Watson, Pa.
Mason	Rowe	Stafford	Welty
Mondell	Rowland	Stephens, Miss.	Whaley
Morin	Russell	Stephens, Nebr.	White, Ohio
Mudd	Sabath	Sterling	Woods, Iowa
Neely	Sanders, La.	Stiness	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. REAVIS.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. EMERSON.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. PARKER of New York.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. STRONG.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. GOODALL.

Mr. MAHER with Mr. TINKHAM.

Mr. BOOHER with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. DEWALT with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. SMALL with Mr. MUDD.

Mr. BENSON with Mr. STINESS.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. BROWNE.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. AUSTIN.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. CRAIG.

Mr. DENT with Mr. KAHN.

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. GOULD.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. HELM with Mr. HUSTED.

Mr. HELVERING with Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. LOBECK with Mr. MCKINLEY.

Mr. MCANDREWS with Mr. MCKENZIE.

Mr. NEELY with Mr. MASON.

Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. ROWE.

Mr. PARK with Mr. SANFORD.

Mr. PRICE with Mr. SIEGEL.

Mr. SARATH with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana with Mr. TINKHAM.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia with Mr. WALSH.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. IRELAND.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. WHALEY with Mr. GREENE of Vermont.

Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. FOCHT.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. BROWNE, vote?

The SPEAKER. He did not.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am paired with the gentleman, and I desire to answer "present."

The name of Mr. CARAWAY was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recorded "no."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask that I may be permitted to withdraw that vote and vote "present."

The name of Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. CLARK of Florida, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present; the Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Mr. CLARK of Florida. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to amend the title of the bill by striking out the word "and" between "soldiers and sailors," insert a comma after "soldiers," and then after the word "sailors" add the words "and marines."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONDITIONS AT WALTER REED HOSPITAL.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask for that time, if the House will be quiet for a moment, in order to read the following resolution:

House resolution 530.

Resolution providing for an investigation of the treatment of sick and disabled soldiers at the Walter Reed Hospital, Washington, D. C.

Whereas the following charges are made in the public press of the city of Washington, viz: That sick and wounded soldiers who have returned from overseas and are now in Walter Reed Hospital have not received any compensation for many months; that the clothing of such soldiers is not laundered for them; that such sick and wounded soldiers are forced to launder their own clothing; and that the food furnished them is not such as should be supplied for sick and wounded persons; and

Whereas these things if true are utterly inexcusable and damnable and a disgrace to this great Nation; and

Whereas the officer or officers responsible for such a condition of affairs should be exposed to the scorn of the outraged people of America and otherwise punished: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs of this House be, and hereby is, instructed to immediately, and in preference to all other business, make a full and complete investigation of these charges and report their findings to the House at the very earliest practicable moment, and if they find all or any of these wrongs existing to suggest a remedy therefor and report the names of the person or persons responsible for such outrages on the brave soldiers of the United States.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] objects.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leaves of absence were granted as follows:

To Mr. DAVEY, for three days on account of important business.

To Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. STAFFORD,) on account of illness.

To Mr. HAWLEY, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

RELIEF OF STARVING POPULATIONS OF EUROPE.

Mr. SHERLEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, presented a conference report on the bill H. R. 13708, an act providing for the relief of such populations in Europe and countries contiguous thereto, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President as necessary, for printing under the rules.

PENSION APPROPRIATIONS (H. REPT. NO. 997).

Mr. GALLIVAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 15219) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which was read the first and second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 13879, which was the bill passed by the House last Saturday, providing a pension for the widow of the late Col. Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the pension bill for Mrs. Roosevelt. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. To ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill just passed, H. R. 13026.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a similar request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15018) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and pending that I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] as to the division of time in general debate.

Mr. HAUGEN. I have a number of requests, which will take about three hours on this side.

Mr. LEVER. I intended to suggest to the gentleman that I think we can get along on this side with possibly the half of three hours and a half. I wonder if the gentleman can not come down a little bit in his figures?

Mr. HAUGEN. That would be only one hour and three-quarters on each side.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I can not possibly do that.

Mr. LEVER. Can not the gentleman squeeze along with two?

Mr. HAUGEN. I would be willing to chance it at two hours and a half. The requests will have to be cut about an hour at that.

Mr. LEVER. I hope the gentleman can make it two hours on a side.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am sure I would like to accommodate the gentleman. I desire to expedite the passage of the bill as much as anyone.

Mr. LEVER. I am sure of that.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will take my chances on that—two hours on each side.

Mr. SHERLEY. Pending the gentleman's motion, it is my understanding, from a talk had with the gentleman from South Carolina, that general debate will run for what length of time it may to-night, and that to-morrow the gentleman will give way in order that there may be taken up for consideration the deficiency bill that I reported to the House a day or two ago?

Mr. LEVER. The understanding is correct.

Mr. MADDEN. If I may inject myself, as to running to-night, if the committee expects to run longer than two hours on general debate to-night, there will have to be a quorum here.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that my hope is to finish the general debate to-night.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman will have to have a quorum here.

Mr. HAUGEN. I trust arrangements may be made that half of the four hours may be consumed this evening and two hours at the next time we meet for the consideration of this bill.

Mr. LEVER. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that appropriation bills are now ready for the consideration of the House, and we ought at least to complete general debate on this bill to-night. We can do it by 9 o'clock. Some gentlemen need not stay here. I will be here to listen to the eloquence, even if other gentlemen do not desire to listen to it. There will be no business done except that.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I yield.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman assures the House there will be no other business transacted except speechmaking?

Mr. LEVER. Absolutely none, so far as I know.

Mr. GARNER. And if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] or any other gentleman desires to go to the opera or any other place of amusement or business he can go along, and read the speeches in the RECORD to-morrow.

Mr. LEVER. As he always does, I hope.

Mr. GARNER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the general debate on this bill be confined to four hours, two hours to be used by the gentleman from Iowa and two hours by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the general debate shall not exceed four hours, two hours to be controlled by himself and two hours by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] will please take the chair.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture that some agreement be reached as to the time of adjournment this evening, that we may, at least, have one hour after to-day. It was understood by one gentleman for whom time was reserved that he was to take it to-morrow.

Mr. LEVER. I am glad the gentleman from Iowa mentioned that. There is one gentleman on his side and one on this side who would like to have time for general debate later than to-day. If agreeable to the House, these gentlemen may be permitted to use their time at the conclusion of the bill, when the bill is finished.

Mr. STAFFORD. We could not consent to any such arrangement as that.

Mr. LEVER. I am trying to accommodate the gentleman.

Mr. HAUGEN. Let it be understood that three hours of general debate will be consumed this afternoon, and that will leave one hour for the next day.

Mr. LEVER. I will agree to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina will agree to what?

Mr. LEVER. That three hours' general debate be had this evening, and one hour later.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina agrees that three hours of general debate be had this evening, and one hour later.

Hour of Meeting to-morrow—11 o'clock A. M.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, may I make a unanimous-consent request that the House meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the House meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will agree that not more than two hours of the debate shall be consumed to-night I will agree to 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. GARNER. All they want is three hours to-night.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentlemen from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], as I understand, wants to make a speech on the railroad bill during this general debate, and he is not prepared to make it until to-morrow. I think he ought to be accommodated with time; but what has already been agreed on will accommodate him and also accommodate one man on this side, too.

Mr. GARNER. I understand that the gentleman from Texas has made a request to that effect himself.

Mr. MADDEN. He has not made a request, but I understand he is not ready to go on to-night.

Mr. RAYBURN. I am willing to go on to-night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15018, the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15018, the Agricultural appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15018) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, one of the greatest duties that a country owes to its people is that which rests upon it with regard to the agricultural classes. No country has long prospered that has neglected and failed to encourage and protect its agricultural class in its legitimate rights and interests. Rome reached the highest point in her civilization when greatest stress and emphasis were placed upon agriculture, and Rome fell when she ceased to protect and safeguard her agricultural interests.

The great Government of the United States owes it to the men who produce the things we eat and wear to protect them from sharks and robbers of every kind. [Applause.] I want to speak a little while this afternoon upon the great cotton industry of the United States, and to call the attention of this House and of the country to the fact that to-day a gambling institution, operating in violation of law, is in existence in the city of New York, and it is destroying cotton values by its future quotations by the millions every day. It has destroyed cotton values this day to the amount of \$22,000,000 or \$23,000,000. It has destroyed cotton values—11,000,000 bales of cotton—inside of 15 days, \$330,000,000. I submit to this House and to the intelligent and fair judgment of the American people that

this is wrong, and that it is outrageous for Congress to permit it. It is wrong and outrageous for this Government to permit it.

I want to call to your attention, gentlemen, the fact that when we had prospects of 15,000,000 bales of cotton, cotton was above 25 cents a pound, and when the drouth came in Texas, the greatest cotton-producing State of the Union [applause], and cut her crop in half, and swept through the South, destroying cotton prospects in July, and cutting down our cotton crop prospects to 11,300,000 bales, all told, cotton has been driven down below 24 cents a pound on the exchanges. The future price for January is at variance with the spot price for January \$40 a bale. Now, gentlemen, do you not know that that is gambling and that that is highway robbery? The demand for American cotton of the 1918 crop is six or seven million bales more than the supply. The countries outside of America, with Germany and Austria included—

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. I can not yield, my time is so limited. It is believed that Germany and Austria will be receiving cotton by the last of February or the first of March. Some of our friends amongst the allies say Germany and Austria ought to be permitted to receive raw material—cotton, amongst other things—so that they can get to work to make money to pay the large indemnities that will be assessed against them. It is claimed that German interests want 1,000,000 bales now to hold, so that when the time comes that they can receive cotton they may be sure of a part of the small crop. Japan has instructed her agents in Louisiana and Texas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas, I am told, to pay a higher price than anybody else to get her supply of cotton and hold it. She realizes that the supply is small. And yet this cotton exchange, day after day, with no cotton to deliver, is tendering the dog-tail stuff upon contracts that no spinner can use.

The spinner can not be supplied from that exchange. It is not helping the producer. It is hurting and robbing him. Then pray tell me, gentlemen, what good service it is performing in our country? What legitimate interest does it serve? The spinner can not get his cotton supply through it. The producer is being robbed by it, and I contend to-day that if this exchange intends to continue to be an outlaw that it ought to be abolished. The Louisiana State lottery is gone. The whisky traffic is doomed, and why not destroy gambling in farm products? Any institution that is morally wrong in its conduct has no excuse for existence in legitimate trade, and I believe that we must come to the idea so ably advocated by my friend from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] of spot cotton exchanges, of spot produce exchanges of every kind. I have always favored this idea. You do not need an exchange for automobiles, and there are millions and millions of dollars invested in them. It is a flourishing business. You do not need an exchange for horses and mules, yet people deal in them and they make money speculating in them by investing money in them and selling the real article. The hay crop of the United States is nearly as big as the cotton crop. You do not have any hay exchange. Why is it necessary to have a fictitious exchange for cotton and grain, except to give the gambler and the robber an advantage that they can not have in the spot markets of the country? [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Does the gentleman contend that the exchange in New York is violating the law?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do, and I have called on the Department of Justice to-day for an investigation and prosecution.

Mr. HAUGEN. They are delivering the cats and dogs on the contract, the gentleman says, but is it not a fact that the law legalizes the very thing that is being done by the board?

Mr. HEFLIN. I said that they were delivering dog-tail cotton. The law requires that they deliver the standard grades adopted by Congress—nine grades. Of course, the Bureau of Markets has changed and spread out the grades to 21 or 22. I am opposed to this variation and changing of the grades, and I do not think that they are authorized to do it under the law; but here is what I want to bring to the attention of the Congress and the country. When the ocean was full of submarines, when it was difficult to deliver cotton to any foreign port, when it was difficult to get cotton over there at all, cotton went up to 37 cents a pound. When these submarine desperadoes of the deep were looking out for every ship that bore cotton and ready to sink them, the demand for cotton was so great that the exchanges quoted the price at 37 cents a pound. Why was it? Because the world knew that the crop of Europe was a failure; they were producing food supplies on their former cotton area and were looking to America for cotton, and after the drouth in July our crop

was cut short and we were going to have a small supply, and the great demand is what put cotton up to 37 cents. That is what did it.

Now, what is putting it down? The submarines are gone from the sea, the embargo against cotton has been removed to all countries except Germany and Austria, and probably that will be removed in five or six weeks. What is it? I ask you gentlemen, as honest men, what causes this putting down of the price of American cotton?

Here is my answer to that: They have a combination with the foreign spinners and some American spinners, and they are back of the bear speculators and are going on the exchange and selling stuff they do not own; no cotton is delivered on contract; they are settling without regard to the price of spot cotton the differences between the various grades. No delivery of cotton and no settlement according to the difference between the grades in the spot markets.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; but I have only a short time.

Mr. SNYDER. When the gentleman speaks of the spinners in this country and the foreign spinners, he includes the spinners of the South?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; I think that some of them are in it.

Mr. SNYDER. One more question. The gentleman claims that the exchange in New York is responsible. He does not attempt by that to put the burden of the operation on that exchange in New York—the New York men only—does he?

Mr. HEFLIN. No; I am telling you now that some of the foreign spinners are in a conspiracy and combination and are operating on that exchange.

Mr. SNYDER. One more question and then I will sit down. The Democratic Party has been in power for six years, and the same law has been in existence all of that period.

Mr. HEFLIN. This law was passed about four years ago.

Mr. SNYDER. It was passed by a Democratic Congress. Why during all that period have you not changed it?

Mr. HEFLIN. The law is an improvement on the old law. I am in favor of making a change in the present law, as Senator SMITH of South Carolina is. I am in favor of confining them to the delivery on exchange contracts to about six grades of real spinable cotton, and we have got to come to that. The cotton crop of the United States, 85 or 90 per cent of it, is a good grade and would be represented by these six grades. Now they are seeking to use the low-grade stuff—10 per cent of the crop—to fix the price of the 85 and 90 per cent of the good grade. Now, coming back to what I was discussing when interrupted before.

Mr. EAGLE. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; I will yield to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. EAGLE. If beating down the price from 37 cents, where it was, to 24 cents, where it now is, in spite of the demand for it, which shows its natural course, if that was for the benefit of the consuming public I should look with more complaisance on it, but the fact is that the spinners of the United States came to the Government a year ago, in anticipation of the purchase of this year's crop, and obtained permission to fix the price for goods, wares, and merchandise of America at the contemplated price of 37½ cents a pound. Therefore, every cent per pound that they beat that price down does not help the consuming public in America at all; it merely robs the poor farmer of the South in order to put money into the spinners' pockets. [Applause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, that is precisely true. My good friend from Texas has made a very valuable contribution to the argument that I am trying to make. It has been said on good authority that there is no commodity except iron and steel which plays so great a part in the industrial life of the world and the well-being of its inhabitants as does cotton. Mr. Holland, a recognized authority on all American industries, in the Cincinnati Enquirer, of Ohio, wrote this, from which I read, and he said:

It is certain that at least for five years after the termination of the war cotton fiber must be relied upon for making up the shortage in wool and flax.

Gentlemen, the wool crop is short, the flax crop is short, the cotton crop is short, and the world is demanding large quantities of American cotton. The ending of the war has set free 151,000,000 spindles, and the sea is free of submarines, but we are permitting in the United States Government a monstrous gambling establishment, and I indict it as such, to beat down without any justifiable excuse the value of the product of thirty-odd millions of American citizens. I have seen cotton sell for \$30 a bale. It now costs \$30 a bale after it is made to pick it out and gin it and put bagging and ties upon it, and get it on the market. And these figures are not included in the cost of production. It cost 25 cents a pound to produce cotton in America in 1918,

and yet the exchange has beaten down the price up to this time more than \$40 a bale in two weeks. Figure that on 11,000,000 bales of cotton and see what the cotton producers of the United States are losing. Get facts, gentlemen, in this connection. The South is not selling her cotton, and she is not going to sell it at these destructive prices. The governors of the cotton-growing States have called on the producers to hold it, and why? Because they know that we can not sell it under 30 cents a pound and make a profit, and the only thing that we can do is to hold it for a fair and reasonable price, and we are doing it. As soon as this Congress adjourns on the 4th of March, Members of Congress from the cotton-growing States are going to tour the cotton belt and urge the farmers to cut down their acreage and tell them that, although they have made an 11,000,000 bale crop and the world needs 18,000,000 bales, they are being held up and robbed of a fair profit, and the only wise and safe thing to do is to cut down their acreage. We will tell them, and it is true, we can get more for 9,000,000 bales than for 12,000,000, and why not make something else, where they produce the other 3,000,000 bales?

The boll weevil is all over the cotton belt; it did more damage last year than in any other year. We planted the largest acreage that we have ever planted and made one of the smallest crops. We will greatly reduce our acreage this year. It is hard to produce cotton in the presence of the boll weevil. We will plant this acreage in something else. We can get more for hogs, more for peas, more for velvet beans, for peanuts, and for hay and corn and all those things than we can get for cotton, and there is no gambling exchange to steal away the profit on these things. So, gentlemen, this section of the United States is driven to this course because here is an institution that beats down the value of its products when the world is demanding their crops. Do you know what spot cotton is worth to-day? Twenty-eight, 29, and 30 cents a pound, and the future market for the same month has put it down to 22 and 23 and 24 cents a pound. It is nothing on this earth but robbery and rottenness in the conduct of an exchange that can produce a condition like that. Suppose here is an exchange operating, and you are selling a product that I am holding and the world has got to have it, and I have not enough to supply the world. Here is an exchange using merely the name of cotton and selling it in unlimited quantities and beating down the price of my product, and they beat it down to the exchange price of \$40 a bale, \$440,000,000 on an 11,000,000-bale crop, and yet I refuse to sell; I am holding my cotton and the world is demanding more than I have, and, remember, the spot price is around 30 cents a pound. Do you not know there is something wrong and rotten when they can do such a thing as that on the exchange? They do not help to keep in operation the law of supply and demand. They defy it. They stop its operation. They destroy the operation of the law of supply and demand.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. I would like to yield to my friend, but I have only a very short time. I will yield for a question—

Mr. LAZARO. Cotton is my money crop, and I am very much interested in the gentleman's speech. I am heartily in favor of eliminating every abuse on the cotton exchange; but the gentleman does not mean that he wants a legitimate cotton exchange destroyed, does he?

Mr. HEFLIN. Not the legitimate cotton exchanges. Judging from their present conduct, those that I refer to do not come within that class.

Mr. LAZARO. What about the cotton exchange in New Orleans?

Mr. HEFLIN. The cotton exchange in New Orleans is not as bad as the cotton exchange in New York, but it is following in its footsteps somewhat. The prices on the New York exchange are reflected on the New Orleans exchange; and one reason why the New Orleans exchange ought to be better is because it is in the cotton-producing country. It ought to be a spot market, but the exchange of New York has no such reason for existence.

It is a thousand miles away from the cotton belt. Why is it that you do not have a grain exchange up there? They have got the great grain exchange in the West, at Chicago, where it ought to be. What business have you got with a cotton exchange in New York? New Orleans or some other place in the cotton belt is where you ought to have a big exchange, and it ought to be a spot exchange. I can not discuss that question now, but will later—

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman understands—

Mr. HEFLIN. My time is so short—

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman admits that he is in favor of a legitimate exchange?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am in favor of a legitimate exchange, but they are not being operated as such institutions now and I indict them now as conducted at the present time as enemies to the cotton producer. I am in favor of the prosecution of them and if we can not regulate them I want to abolish them as we abolished the Louisiana State lottery. [Applause.] That is where I stand upon it. An exchange may be needed for hedging purposes, grain and cotton, and, gentlemen, I have a plan. Like life and fire insurance, cotton and grain can be handled. They insure my house; they insure the object itself. They take the risk, and that is legitimate speculation. They insure my life, and if I die those whom I leave behind will get the policy upon my life insurance. Why not have an exchange run upon that system—have real grain or cotton back of every contract. Here is a man who produces 20 bales of cotton. He goes upon the exchange and says, "I want to sell 20 bales of cotton." "Are you a farmer?" "Yes." "Put your name down here, where you live, etc." They keep a record. "You want to sell 20 bales of cotton?" "Yes." The buyer comes up and says, "I will buy your 20 bales for delivery in October." "All right." He is a legitimate speculator, and he is dealing in real cotton. The spinner says, "I have bought 10,000 bales of cotton for my mill, I want to be insured against losses. I want to be protected on the exchange and I will sell futures, 10,000 bales." "All right, I will buy your 10,000 bales," says a legitimate speculator—and then when you get through with that process—and I have not time to go into the details now, I will at some other time—when you get through with it you have confined your speculation in cotton or grain to the crop itself. The merchant, banker, anybody who is interested in spot cotton can use this exchange. And so with wheat and corn. They are dealing in real produce and not in a fictitious stuff that is not in existence. Why, frequently they sell on your grain exchanges millions of bushels of grain more than your crop ever amounted to.

They have sold on the New York Cotton Exchange this year many times the amount of cotton produced in the United States. Now, is that fair? Is it right and just? I want to bring them down to legitimate dealing, and let me say in this connection—

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. HEFLIN. No; I have not the time, I am sorry. The statement that I wish to read is from the Government's Department of Commerce and Labor. It says:

The rise in the cost of raw material has been more the result of natural than of artificial causes. There has been a material advance in the prices of practically all commodities, and cotton has shared in this; but in the case of cotton, this advance has also been furthered by a constantly broadening demand for the fiber in the old as well as in the new channels. Cotton is relied upon now in practically all the textile manufactures, either as a primary or a secondary material, and it is utilized in an increasing number in all other manufacturing industries. The ease and rapidity with which cotton fiber is transformed into yarn and its adaptability for all forms of woven fabric accounts for its extensive and increasing use.

It is being put to more use to-day than ever before in the history of the world. [Applause.] It is the smallest crop the world has ever seen with the number of spindles in existence to consume it, and yet when the war is over and people can return to the various fields of activity, when the first crop of cotton is six or seven million bales short of the demand, the manipulators of the exchanges fly in the face of the law of supply and demand and beat down the price.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. I would like to have five minutes if the chairman of the committee has any additional time.

Mr. LEVER. I can not find one single, solitary minute on my list; I have promised it all.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. If the chairman will make his allowance to me now I will give just a little bit of that time—

Mr. HEFLIN. I would like to have five minutes more in which to finish.

The CHAIRMAN. The time was fixed in the House.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have been interrupted and a good deal of my time was taken up in that way.

Mr. HAUGEN. I had requests for more than three hours' time which was cut down to two hours. I spoke to a number of gentlemen and they gave in part of their time, and I hope with part of that time I will be able to take care of a number, and I hope to be able to take care of all of them.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask unanimous consent—

The CHAIRMAN. The time is in the control of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. LEVER. I regret very much that I have not the time. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama, but I have promised more time really than I have.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to take advantage of the general debate to discuss a problem which is not directly dealt with in the Agricultural appropriation bill but which will presently be here for solution. I recognize the fact that the House desires to get through these appropriation bills at the earliest possible moment, and I intend to reach the particular phase of the problem which I intend to discuss by the shortest possible route, eliminating every statement of fact which is not necessary to the discussion which I intend to pursue.

Under the food-control act the President has guaranteed the price of wheat produced in 1919 until the 1st day of June, 1920. I do not intend to discuss the wisdom or the unwisdom of making that guaranty. But I would not be fair to myself or to the administration if I did not say that, in my opinion, the guaranty was wisely made and justified by the conditions which existed at the time it was made as a war measure. But whether it is wise or unwise, we have made it, and I assume it will be the intention of the Congress and of the Government to make it good. Not to make it good will be to invite social, political, and economic consequences which will be far-reaching and long continued. The question which I intend is not whether the guaranty shall be made good but how shall the guaranty be made good. What plan shall be adopted by the Government to make it good? Two plans have been proposed for this purpose. The first of these plans proposes that the Government, using the same machinery and the same methods which have obtained in making good the guaranty of the 1918 crop, shall undertake to maintain the price of the 1919 crop; and, of course, that means maintaining a guaranty not only of price of wheat at the guaranteed level, but also the price of wheat products made from that wheat bought at the guaranteed price. It means that all of the loss represented by the difference between the world's price of wheat of this year—1919—and the guaranteed price shall be implemented against the consumer of wheat flour and wheat products.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I wonder if the gentleman received a letter from the Bay State Milling Co. this morning?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I received that letter.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Under date of January 22. What is your action as to the proposal made by this concern?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am going to discuss the plans I have in mind, and one of them is substantially the same as the plan which the writer of the letter that the gentleman refers to outlines.

The second plan contemplates that the difference between the world price and the guaranteed price for the 1919 crop shall be absorbed by the Government at the source, and that from that point on the wheat shall move forward in the regular commercial channels at the world price. In other words, the second plan contemplates the Government shall pay full guaranteed price to the farmer at his own local elevator, which, of course, would mean the price at the nearest terminal, less the freight, and from that time on the grain shall move through the regular channels at the world price. The statement of these two plans in general is very simple, but they both involve difficulties and possible commercial and economic losses very much greater than the simplicity of the statement would in itself indicate.

I want to very briefly outline, if I can, the objections and difficulties to be met with in adopting either one plan or the other. The objections to the first plan, it seems to me, are not only great but absolutely insurmountable.

The first of these objections is that it is doubtful whether we have the power under the Constitution to extend the war powers under which we passed the food-control act in such a way as to give to the Food Administration or some similar agency the power to carry out the guaranteed price in the sense of maintaining that price throughout the entire period between the 1st of June, 1919, and the 1st of June, 1920. The second objection lies in the fact that the commercial risk involved in handling wheat or wheat products, bought at a price very much higher than the world's price and undertaking to sell that product in the market, is so great or would be so great under the fixed or

maintained price theory that no commercial concern could afford to undertake it.

The third objection is that with a large surplus, such as we are likely to have next year, it is desirable to increase consumption. The plan of maintaining the price of wheat and wheat products on the basis of the guaranteed price would result naturally in reducing consumption and thereby defeat the very object which we have in mind.

The fourth objection is that the whole cost of maintaining the guaranty would implement itself against the consumer in this country, while the foreign consumer would get the benefit of our very large export, because, of course, the exports would have to be on the basis of the world's market, and all the sacrifice that would be made by the consumer in this country in maintaining the price would entirely inure to the benefit of the consumer in the foreign country.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Does not the gentleman think that if the price were reduced voluntarily by the consent of the Government and by the aid of the United States Food Administration Grain Corporation that would help in itself to establish a low world price?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know that I get the gentleman's question exactly.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Well, the action of Congress or our Grain Corporation along the line the gentleman suggests might be an important factor in establishing the world's price.

Mr. ANDERSON. Unquestionably so. In what I am saying I am referring entirely to the theory of meeting this guaranty by maintaining the wheat price, both to the producer and for consumption on the basis of the guaranteed price of wheat. I am not now referring to the other plan.

The fifth objection to which I desire to call attention is that while under the first plan the consumer will have borne the entire loss during the crop year, at the end of June 1, 1920, we shall still have in some way to absorb the loss represented by the difference between the guaranteed price at that time and the world price that then exists; while, of course, under the second plan that I have mentioned, that absorption would take place immediately at the local market, beginning with this crop year.

The sixth objection to this plan is that it involves a larger expenditure, a larger initial capital, both on the part of the Government and on the part of the private commercial concern. It seems to me that these objections are absolutely insurmountable. They are such that the commercial work out of that plan is absolutely out of the question.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. It may not be directly in point, but it is contemplated in all these proceedings that there shall be an embargo on the importation of wheat until June 1, 1920, is reached, to prevent the competition of foreign wheat with our own Government-controlled price.

Mr. ANDERSON. I assume that if we should get the maximum or anything like the maximum crop from the present indicated acreage, what would amount to an embargo on the importation of wheat would be necessary; and I may say that, on the basis of the present acreage, the crop might run all the way from 825,000,000 bushels to 1,275,000,000 bushels.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Do I understand the gentleman to state that in the first plan is contemplated the guaranteeing not only of the price of wheat, but also the price of all the by-products of wheat?

Mr. ANDERSON. It seems to me that is the inevitable result of it, because a miller or any other wheat-product manufacturer could not afford to buy wheat on the basis of \$2.20 and sell his flour on the basis of \$1.65; so that a wheat-price maintenance plan contemplates, of course, not only that the price of wheat be maintained, but that also the price of flour to the consumer shall be maintained on the same level, as we have done in the past year.

Mr. SNYDER. Not only flour, but other products?

Mr. ANDERSON. It seems to me so; yes.

As I have indicated, the Government's loss—and it is probable that there will be a loss on the guarantee—will be taken up at the source—that is, at the elevator at which the farmer sells his grain; and from that time onward the grain shall move forward in the regular commercial channels on the basis of the world's price.

Now, the method of taking up that difference is, of course, a mere matter of mechanics.

A plan that has been suggested is that the farmer who brings his wheat to the elevator shall be given a check for the full guaranteed price indicated at his particular station, and that that check shall be deposited at the bank, and at the bank the proportionate part of it which should be charged to the commercial buyer shall be charged against the account of that commercial buyer, and the balance, indicated by the then existing world market, shall be charged against an account kept for that purpose by the Government. There are other plans of the same sort. The whole question is one, as I say, of mechanics, and one which is certainly not impossible of solution.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I dislike to interrupt the gentleman if it bothers him at all in the discussion of the question, but I should like to suggest that the method of settlement which he has just described would involve a very difficult matter of accounting upon the part of the Government in making the settlements and auditing them and checking them up.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no doubt that there is certain room for fraud, and that certain mechanical difficulties are incident to and perhaps inseparable from that method. But they are so small relatively when compared with the difficulty of meeting the guaranty in the other way that I do not think they are, by any means, impossible to overcome. I have talked with men who have had to do with the making good of the guaranty during the current year, and they all seem to think that the mechanics of that proposition can be worked out in some way which will reduce the possible fraud to a very small minimum. I feel confident that that can be done.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. This second plan that the gentleman speaks of is set forth in a letter that I presume all of us got from a millman.

Mr. ANDERSON. It has been incorporated in several letters.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I got only one. It strikes me that there is this danger with it under the Government guaranty of \$2.26: The Government has got to make good to that extent. We settle with the farmer at the elevator on the basis of \$2.26. That leaves it so that the millmen and the elevator men all over the country have an interest to batter down the price. If they could do it, and get the wheat at 90 cents, then the Government would have to shoulder the additional load.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no chance of battering down the price, because the settlement would be made on the basis of the price at the terminal, where, of course, the ordinary commercial machinery would be in operation, so that the price would be fixed on the world's basis, just as it would be if no guaranty were fixed at all.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. How would you arrive at the commercial price?

Mr. ANDERSON. The commercial price will be fixed in exactly the same way as it would be under normal conditions; that is, by buying and selling upon the exchange.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Would anybody feel interested in keeping up the high price of the wheat? The producer has got his \$2.26. Therefore would not the interest at the other end of the line be to beat down the commercial price?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am frank to admit that the situation which the gentleman outlines represents an objection which is at least partially good, but I assume that the Government will be in the market all the time, and that the Government will be prepared to take any surplus that may be thrown into the channels of trade, so that the ordinary channels of consumption and manufacture will never at any time be overloaded with a surplus of the product coming to the mills.

Mr. SLOAN. May I suggest that the Government would be in a position to tell what the average market would be, not only in America but in Liverpool and other places throughout the world, and the Government would practically say what the commercial price was, and speculators could not control it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that would be entirely true.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Not without purchasing it, would it?

Mr. LEVER. And would not this be true: That the farmer would sell his wheat just as fast as possible in order to get the guaranteed price and get the money into his own possession?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think he would, subject, of course, to the fact that the bringing of wheat into the market is, to a certain extent, subject to the convenience of the farmer and road conditions and weather conditions and everything of that sort.

Mr. LEVER. And custom as well?

Mr. ANDERSON. And custom as well. And, of course, the same objection that is urged to this plan is just as sound when

urged against the plan of maintaining the price all the way through.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will.

Mr. HAUGEN. Speaking of the loss likely to be incurred, is not it fair to assume that, with the arrangement made in co-operation and at the suggestion of those associated with us in the war, they will assume their share of responsibility and bear their part of the burden? As the gentleman knows, it was at their suggestion that the price of American wheat was cut in two, and it is up to them now, after they have entered into the agreement in cooperation with our Government, to make good with proper safeguards so there will be no surplus of wheat.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the gentleman is correct. I now want to discuss a proposition which the gentleman suggests. Despite the fact that we are perhaps confronted with a large surplus of wheat during 1919 over our probable consumption, the loss to the Government on the guaranty will depend not nearly so much on the fact that the surplus exists as it will upon the conditions that exist in this country and the world generally industrially. In other words, if we have an era of prosperity in the country, if we can remove the export limitation, if we can remove the embargo so that we have every channel open for an outlet and can take full advantage of the consumption capacity of the European countries and the low state of their supply, I think there will be very little difficulty in getting rid of this surplus which we have at a fairly reasonable price.

In that connection I want to say that in 1893, when there was a period of considerable depression in this country, we had a crop of 396,000,000 bushels, which was some 100,000,000 bushels less than the average.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That was both winter and spring wheat?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. We had an export that year of 164,000,000 bushels, leaving us net 232,000,000 bushels, which was equivalent to a per capita consumption in this country of 3.5 bushels. Yet with that very small supply in this country, under industrial conditions that then existed, the price still stood at the lowest of any time in the country's history; while in 1915, under conditions of unexampled prosperity in this country, the supply of wheat in the United States was equivalent to 7.8 bushels per capita, and the effect upon prices in the United States was practically not noticeable. In other words, if we can have generally throughout the world a condition of industrial prosperity, there will be no difficulty in absorbing whatever surplus of wheat the country may have.

In addition to that it is noticeable that most of the increase acreage of both spring and winter wheat will result in the almost equivalent decrease in the acreage of corn. So that, taking the rough products of the farm as a whole, there will not be anything like the actual surplus indicated by the present acreage. After all, the whole question here, it seems to me, and the whole proposition now confronting Congress and the country, resolves itself into establishing a condition of confidence in the Government's ability to maintain the price of wheat during the present crop year and establishing a condition of industrial stability in the country for the next crop year. In other words, if we are not successful in creating a condition of confidence of the country touching the maintenance of the present price and touching conditions for the next year, we may have a situation in which the price of wheat, and probably of other farm products in sympathy, will go far below the normal cost of production. And, incident to that, we may suffer a loss in farms and farm-land values which will far exceed any possible loss that any reasonable man can conceive under the proper administration and payment of the difference involved in the guaranty.

But there is one other situation I want briefly to discuss and that is the question involved in the stepping down from the guaranteed price of wheat to the world's price which will confront us at the beginning of next April.

I do not know that Members generally know it, but it takes about eight to ten million bushels of flour moving from the mills to the channels of consumption constantly, and about the equivalent of eight to ten million barrels of flour in wheat, which would be around 40,000,000 bushels moving from the elevators to the mills in order to supply the consumption of the country.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The gentleman means per month?

Mr. ANDERSON. I mean that much is in transit all of the time. That means that the period between the consumption at one end and the country elevator at the other is in the neigh-

berhood of 60 days. During these 60-day periods the miller is receiving the wheat at the guaranteed price.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. ANDERSON. During the same period the wheat is coming into the market and flour is being made out of it on the basis of the world's price. Some means must be found whereby we can step down from the one basis to the other without putting all of the mills in the country out of business. How this may be done I am not prepared to outline now, but I hope later to offer a suggestion for meeting this difficulty.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the subject which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] has been discussing is one of very great interest to every citizen of the country. There is one thing in connection with the guaranteed price for wheat which I am very glad to notice, and that is that so far as I know there is not a single Member of Congress who has any disposition to fail to go through with it and make good the guaranty contained in the proclamation made by the President. I listened with very great interest to the speech made by the gentleman from Minnesota. I am inclined to think there is a grave danger in the plan suggested by him. Personally I have held the opinion that if the Food Administration Grain Corporation had proper backing, if it were given plenty of money and were given a free hand to handle this crop, it could force a better price for the amount of grain shipped to Europe than the superficial examination of the trade conditions and stores of wheat throughout the world would now indicate. If we were to follow the plan suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], it would seem to me that we would simply capitulate, we would accept the prices that the European buyers would fix, which would mean that the Government would assume an increased financial burden and a much greater burden than there is need for.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Of course the gentleman has not overlooked the fact that the foreign consumer has another market to look to for his wheat.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I have not overlooked that at all, but I tell you this: I think some have in the United States magnified these other possible sources where Europeans may get their supply. A good deal is made in the papers about the fact that there are large stores of wheat in Australia and large stores of wheat in Argentina, but those supplies are hardly available for Europe now, with the very great shortage in ship tonnage.

Mr. SNYDER. It is just as available as ours, only it takes a few days longer to get it there.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It takes three times as long.

Mr. SNYDER. Oh, no; it does not take three times as long.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It takes 120 days to make the round trip from Australia.

Mr. SNYDER. The point I make is that there has always been a market for wheat outside of the United States, and we have to consider that in deciding what is going to be done with this question, and before you can determine what the loss is going to be under the Government guaranty we have to know something about what the other countries are going to charge for their wheat.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. We are never going to determine what the losses will be until we sell the wheat, but what the loss is going to be will depend upon the way in which we dispose of the question right here.

Mr. SNYDER. I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that all of the export markets, all of the market for the surplus of the world is outside of the United States.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Of course they are outside of the United States, but if the gentlemen from Minnesota or any other man were standing at the port of shipment at New York with the entire supply of American wheat, and could absolutely control it, knowing the very great difficulty and almost impossible conditions of Europe getting its supplies because of the shortage of ship tonnage, from Australia and Argentina, I think he could force a better price. There is no use of becoming panicky about this. Some gentlemen are disposed to yell before they are hit. Our exportable balance of wheat this year is not likely to be more than from 250 to 350 millions and the National Treasury need not be made to stand the shrinkage in price upon more than that amount. If we were to follow Mr. ANDERSON's plan, the loss might be figured on as

high as 1,000,000,000 bushels. If the gentleman insists upon urging that plan, he is likely to scare away many friends in this House of the idea of making good the President's wheat guaranty.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think we can get better prices under the conditions I have outlined than if we were to capitulate at the start by following the suggested plan to settle with our farmers at the guaranteed price and the Government accept the loss every day as measured by the world's market price. That would be a surrender to my mind.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman will recollect when he was making a statement of this kind some time ago—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD].

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, there is much of interest and no little uncertainty among the farmers of my district as to what we intend to do in reference to the guaranty. That is really a reflection, in their minds, upon the integrity of this Congress. The truth is that this law fixing the minimum price was made for just such a time as this. No other thought, I think, was in the minds of a majority of the Members of this House when that law was framed, and we have heard no suggestion on the part of any man that he would consider for a moment not living up to the promise we made to the farmer. I have had some little correspondence in reference to the matter, and just to-day I received a letter from a man—we are not a large wheat-growing country—who said that he had bought a tractor, even out in Indiana, where the farms are small; that the boys were gone; that they rented much land; had invested two or three thousand dollars; and in that particular locality the promise of a good crop is not very great; and he wanted to know what we were going to do about it. Of course, there is no disposition on the part of Congress not to fulfill the promise we made to the farmer. I was at a loss, a little bit, to understand the reasoning of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] when I understood him to say that there would be no purchasing corporation in the second plan—

Mr. ANDERSON. No; the gentleman is mistaken about that. Of course, I intended that the grain corporation would continue exercising the same function it does now, having the same power to buy and sell wheat that it has now with reference to the 1918 crop, and it would be in the market at all times to protect the interests of the Government in the maintenance of the price.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. That is really just a continuation of the present plan, rather than two distinct methods of sales, is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the two plans fundamentally are entirely different—

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I agree with that.

Mr. ANDERSON. But both involve the same question and use the identical machinery. Of course, I want to see the machinery used that we have set up, but I want to see that machinery used to accomplish a different result.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Then, if I understand the gentleman, what would occur is this, that the grain corporation would continue and that it would have a fund at its disposal to protect the Government in maintaining prices.

Mr. ANDERSON. Exactly so.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. And the problem then is whether the grain corporation ought to endeavor to hold the price at the point of the guarantee. I am very glad, indeed, I have that cleared up, because I was laboring under a misapprehension in connection with it. It would certainly be foolish for us not to make an appropriation to maintain the machinery we have in order that the Government should be protected.

Mr. BAER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Yes.

Mr. BAER. And does not the gentleman think if we keep this machinery intact that the machinery should keep the restrictions on all the by-products and the manufactured products of the grain? For instance, I understand in Minnesota the other day the Food Department took off the restriction from bran and middlings of wheat, and the mills went up in their price from \$26 to \$46 a ton, and it went up \$2 more the next day. While we are fixing the price for wheat and flour a lot of millers are obtaining extortionate prices for the by-products.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Well, evidently, if you hold the price high the by-products will be kept high. And it is a question as to how far we should go in controlling the selling. Now, I agree with the gentleman that it would be my judgment on the by-products, so far as middlings and bran are concerned, it would be wise to restrict them if we could; but, if I remember, subsidiary organizations were formed, and the farmer

really never got the benefit of the restriction. So I am not sure that the Government, now that we are entering upon peace times, would be any more efficient than it was during war times, when the exigency was great upon us.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Just to find out how high the mountain ahead of us is, does the gentleman know what the wheat product of the Southern Hemisphere is? It is just being harvested now; and, as I understand, do we know practically how many bushels Australasia, South Africa, and South America are producing this year?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I do not know. I would be glad if the gentleman would inform me.

Mr. SLOAN. I do not know. I just wanted to know how high the mountain is that is ahead of us.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The suggestion was made by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young] that when the price is taken off the by-product is doubled in value the same day or the next day. Is there any assurance that that same thing would not occur if they would take the price off of wheat at the present time?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I think the general opinion is that if the guaranteed price was taken off wheat, and I think it has been asserted here on the floor of the House, and by the honored chairman at one time not long ago, wheat would go to \$1.25 a bushel.

Mr. BAER. If they had not fixed a price on it it would have gone to \$5 or \$6 a bushel. Mr. Hoover said that.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. There is no doubt, gentlemen, that the only two products whose price is restricted and not allowed to soar were the two products of wheat and wool.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Let me suggest to the gentleman that the Food Administration fixed the price on cotton seed and on linters during the same time.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. They did it on linters, but I was not informed they did it on cotton seed. I know that cotton seed, which formerly ran from \$5 to \$8 a ton, went up to \$75 or \$80 a ton.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman does not want to be unfair.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. How high did it sell during the war?

Mr. BLACK. Before the United States entered the war we sold it as high as \$60. Of course, cotton seed did go up. It is a vegetable fat, much needed, and it soared very rapidly.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I assure the gentleman I had no idea of provoking that sort of discussion. I mean to be absolutely fair.

Mr. BLACK. I am sure of that.

Mr. LEVER. My recollection is that when the price was fixed on cotton seed it was selling at \$82 a ton.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. And will the gentleman kindly inform me when the price was fixed?

Mr. LEVER. Shortly after the passage of the food-control act.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. And what was the Government price?

Mr. LEVER. Seventy to seventy-one dollars a ton.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I may state to the gentleman that in my State it sold at \$66 a ton.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I confess to the gentleman it will be very interesting to me to know the absolute facts on all of these questions. I think that any man who speaks here ought not to be willing to say what is not true as to the facts in the case.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is it not true that the price of wheat was reduced 75 cents on the same day that they fixed the price at \$2.25?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I know the price of wheat was ranging between \$2.75 and \$3 a bushel, and it was fixed at \$2.20.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. But be that as it may, gentlemen, it seems to me that it would be utterly foolish for us to permit the organization, which is already effected, to lack an appropriation big enough at any time to control the buying in this country. It is, in my judgment, the only protection that the Government will have.

For if the Government should buy the whole crop at the \$2.20 price per bushel and should then sell at the world's price, it will have lost nothing on the guarantee, and who is there that would say that such action on the part of the Government would not enhance the price, and thus save the Government from much of loss. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am sorry to change the subject that the committee is considering at this time, but I want to invite the attention of members of the committee to a matter that, in my judgment, is very important and which I think ought to be given attention.

I now want to speak about the manner in which claims against the United States are handled. Under the Constitution the United States may not be sued, yet claims are constantly arising against the United States—claims so meritorious that were an honest citizen in the place of the United States he would not rest until he had made settlement. The Government should do no less. The Government should be as honest as it wants its citizens to be. These claims arise and have arisen in a multitude of ways, and we have tried to meet them; but our whole system has been imperfect.

Early in the history of our country we recognized the obligation we owed to those who had fought our country's battles, and we passed laws making land grants as a sort of reward or compensation for services rendered. We did this by act of Congress. In this same connection we granted more favorable conditions under land laws to those whom the Government owed for military service. We have granted special consideration to them touching employment. Beyond that, and involving a vast expenditure, we have recognized the Nation's obligation or debt to our soldiers and those dependent upon them by a system of pensions more generous than has ever been devised by any other Government. Chiefly these grants have been provided for by general law, yet, too, largely by special act, and to-day thousands of individual pension cases receive the special attention of Congress.

But still other claims arose, and with the expanding business of the Government, the taking over by the Government of vast works that private interests had handled in earlier days, the liability of the Government increased. I shall not go into minute detail, but the expansion of Government activities and Government liabilities caused us to pass a few years ago the employees' compensation law, through which automatically claims of a certain class against the Government are adjusted without reference to Congress.

Again, we established the Court of Claims and provided that that court should hear certain causes referred to it from executive departments and from the Congress.

Yet, in spite of all this, the Congress finds itself called upon to consider at every session a multitude of claims. Some of the claims are large, some are small; and the merits of the claims are as wide apart as are the amounts different in size.

SAMPLES.

Let me mention to you a few clear-cut claims that may suggest the general demand that is made upon Congress along this line:

Case 1. The Government issues patent to a piece of land to A, an Indian, who was not required to make any improvements, and later issues patent to the same piece of land to B, a homesteader. B has made extensive improvements, built a house, fences, brought the land under cultivation, planted an orchard, lived upon the land for years. He has made a home. Yet in a court B's patent can be set aside or canceled, for the Government had no authority to issue it. Yet how about the Government's liability to B? The Government has committed an outrageous blunder. Surely liability exists.

Case 2. The Post Office Department awards C the contract to carry the mail on star route Y to Z for \$1,500 per annum. C is told that bond will be adjusted as soon as possible, but in meantime he should go ahead with work. C does so, and sends in bond in a few weeks. Error is discovered and bond is returned to C. C's bondsmen discover that C has under bid and are delighted that bond is imperfect and refuse to renew it. C continues to carry mail for six months under direction of department till new contract is awarded to X. Then C is told that under the law he can not be paid, because his bond was imperfect. The Government owes him \$700 that any honest man in the Government's place would pay at once.

Case 3. A Government department is about to build a public building at W. Before awarding building contract office arranges by a special contract with D to drive piling to test out character of foundation necessary at a cost of \$125. By oral arrangement inspector is to be notified when D is ready for test and is to report at once. D performs his duty fully, inspector is notified, but delays reporting for four days. Contractor is paying \$2.50 each to 4 laborers, who are to help with test, \$10 per day. After four days' delay, inspector shows up. Government admits its fault but says it has no authority to pay D the \$40 that he as an honest man has had to pay his

workmen. Any honest man in the Government's place would pay D.

Case 4. The Government Forest Service, through the utter recklessness and carelessness on part of its employee or agent, and while the latter is doing official work for the Government, burns \$1,000 worth of logs and telephone poles belonging to E. Any honest man in the Government's place would make full settlement at once with E.

Now, in all the above cases and others that I could mention, an honest claim has arisen against the Government—a claim so honest, so just, that if it were against any Member of this House settlement would be made at once.

PRESENT METHOD OF SETTLEMENT A SORRY STORY.

More than that, in each of the foregoing claims referred to the particular executive department under which the claim arose could not make settlement. The claims are recognized as just, and yet no settlement may be made under any general law. Moreover, the injured party may not sue the Government in any court. What shall B, C, D, and E do under the circumstances? Why, they take up the matter with their Representatives in Congress or their Senators. A bill is introduced, it is referred to a proper committee, and evidence is furnished. From that point on the progress of the matter is a sorry story. Each of the claims referred to above has been recommended favorably by the department in which it arose, each has been reported by a committee in the House or Senate from one to three or four different times. One of them has passed both House and Senate in different Congresses. No lack of diligence has existed on the part of the claimant or on the part of the Member of Congress in prosecuting the claims. Yet the claims are still unpaid. In one instance the claim is 10 years old. They are all on the calendar of the House to-day, the first one having been on the calendar since June 4, 1918. We simply have not had time to consider these small items in the stress of big matters. If a private individual were involved instead of the Government we would say he did not have time to be honest and pay his just debts. Let us not say that of our Government. Let us say, rather, that we are working under a most stupid system in the matter of claims of this character, and let us see if we can not work out a better system.

The claims above referred to involve amounts ranging from \$40 to \$750. Why, in any community in the country a court would direct a trustee or administrator of an estate to pay a claim that was as well authenticated and not contested by a living soul; or if the claim were in dispute between neighbors it would be tried before a justice of the peace in my State or in the district court. Yet here we say that since the Government is involved we shall ask 435 busy Representatives and 96 busy Senators to pass upon each claim. We ask, first of all, that busy committees of some 17 or 19 members shall consider each claim, and then after they have reported unanimously we ask that the claim be put on the calendars of the House or Senate, that it then be considered, if it ever can be reached, and then, if passed, that it run the same gauntlet in the other Chamber, and then go to the President for his approval. A \$40 claim! Think of it. A claim that a justice of the peace or a jury—and a jury by a three-fourths vote in Idaho—would pass upon so satisfactorily that there would be no appeal in 9 cases out of 10 if it were between private citizens. Yet as it involves the Government, notwithstanding the fact that the Executive, under whom it arose, admits it, notwithstanding he would pay it, notwithstanding the evidence is overwhelming, and that a jury of 17 or 19 Members of this body, called a committee, say it is just and should be paid, why, we still can not pay it. The bill must pass Congress as though it were a \$10,000,000 appropriation measure. And, gentlemen, it has gotten to the point that, with the pressure of tremendously important business, we do not have time to take up the calendar for the consideration of claims. I turn to the calendar of the House and find the dates claims were placed upon the calendar. Here is one dated March 20, 1918, another March 22, and so on. Yet the House has not even considered these bills.

Why, if you will pick up the calendar of the House for to-day you will see there are something like nine pages devoted to an itemized list of bills which are upon the Private Calendar. You will find there are something like three pages of bills which are upon the Unanimous-Consent Calendar and a large number of them are of private character. You will find that you have something like 200 separate bills of that character reported favorably from committees and awaiting action by the House.

IMPORTANT BUSINESS COMES FIRST.

Now, I am not going to urge that we have been following a policy that is wrong in considering the vast and important

subjects of legislation that we have been considering during this most remarkable session of Congress which has crowded out of consideration the Private-Calender bills.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FRENCH. I will be very glad to do so.

Mr. BLANTON. Is not the cause of which the gentleman so justly complains, the delay of consideration, due more to the fact that a great majority of these private claims are absolutely without merit? Is not that the fact, and is not that the reason for the delay in getting action here through the regular way; that is, the Claims Committee, and through them action by the Congress?

Mr. FRENCH. Well, I would say to the gentleman that I realize that there are many worthless claims presented to the various committees for their consideration. The plan that I shall propose will at once weed out the worthless claims and take care of the just ones. I was upon one of the claims committees of the House for a couple of years and am on one of them now, and I realize that the work of the committee is in large part given over to sorting out worthless claims from those that are good, and yet at the same time it must be admitted that there are hundreds of meritorious claims where, if the gentleman from Texas himself were the one under obligation, he would settle those claims before he would go to bed to-night, because he would recognize their justice.

Mr. BAER. They probably would not get through committee if they were not meritorious.

Mr. FRENCH. No; not at all, generally speaking.

Mr. BLANTON. And they do not get through the committee.

Mr. FRENCH. The unworthy claims for the most part do not, and many of the worthy claims do not get through the committees. Yet we do not come to an end. Bad claims are presented year after year—the same claims, mind you—and we should have a system by which bad claims would be finally disposed of and good claims promptly paid.

Now, gentlemen, it is an outrageous way to treat our citizens. One of the cases I referred to by way of illustration is that of an old man nearly 70 years of age. His claim has been reported at least three times unanimously by a committee of the House or Senate. It has passed the House and the Senate at different Congresses. It is now on the calendar. The department wants to pay it, but the law is so narrow it may not be done. Now, I submit such treatment does not make for good feeling toward our country. Such treatment makes discontent and arouses outraged feelings. Such treatment helps to make Bolsheviks. It helps to make anarchists.

I have seen normally law-abiding men do criminal acts when they have been the victims of an injury, and so have you. And lawlessness is anarchy. Gentlemen, we are asking that our people be honest—that they pay their debts. Yet it is commonly said that it is most impossible for a little fellow to collect a claim from the Government, no matter how just.

THE REMEDY.

Now, what is the remedy? Well, we have done a few things that suggest an answer. When we undertook the construction of the Panama Canal, the operation of the railroad, steamship lines, and so forth, we knew accidents would occur just as they occur for other employers of labor, and that the employer—this time the Government—would sometimes be at fault. So we passed the employees' compensation act of May 30, 1908. Under that act, almost automatically are adjusted claims against the Government. The law has worked admirably.

But this is not all we have done. On September 7, 1916, we passed a more general compensation act for settlement of claims against the Government arising out of employment.

But we have gone further. In the War Risk Insurance act of 1917 we applied the same principle to those in the service of the Government who might sustain injury by reason of such service.

Beyond that we have gone. A few days ago we passed a bill through the House providing that the Secretary of War should have the right to adjudicate contracts arising in the present war, aggregating something like \$2,700,000,000, that were in various stages of completion, but had not been perfected. In other words, we gave to the War Department the power largely to adjudicate those claims.

Now, I submit that we should apply a similar principle in disposing of the miscellaneous claims that arise against the Government.

In the case of the bill we passed a few days ago authorizing the Secretary of War to adjudicate contracts we met a demand from every State in this Union. But, gentlemen, no matter how just the claims may be that will be adjudicated, not one of them will be found more just, more deserving, than that

of the poor old man in Idaho who carried the mail 10 years ago for the Government and has not been paid a single penny for his services. Not one will be more just than that of the homesteader who, through a blunder of some Land Office official or official of the Indian Bureau, was permitted to live for years and improve as a homestead a piece of land that had been patented to an Indian, only to be told by the Government to "Get out" after he had received patent and supposed he had builded a home for himself and family.

What, then, do I propose? I propose as a solution of this question that we authorize every executive department of the Government to adjudicate and make settlement of every claim arising in such department. Since the Government of the United States can not be sued, we can say what shall constitute final action. I would have the action of the secretary of the particular department final in the case of any claim up to, say, \$2,000. Then I would provide in claims larger than that that there might be an appeal, an appeal either on the part of the Government or on the part of the claimant, to the Court of Claims; or possibly you could provide that an appeal be taken, if you want to call it that, to Congress itself in the larger cases. I would also provide that claims be presented within a reasonable time after injury occurred.

Surely, this is a reasonable solution. Gentlemen, if a little question arose in your community involving \$40 or \$750 you would be perfectly willing to trust the disposition of the case to the justice of the peace or to the court that has the smallest jurisdiction. In my State a justice of the peace has jurisdiction of cases up to \$300, or the district court in amounts over that. You would possibly waive a jury, and if you did not a jury, not unanimously, but by a three-fourths vote, would bring in a verdict that in nine cases out of ten would commend itself to the approval of both parties to the litigation, and there would not be an appeal. The case would be settled.

But what shall we say of cases where both sides agree? What shall we say of cases, for instance, that would come before the probate court where a person comes in with a claim and the administrator of the estate says, "Yes; I recognize the justice of the claim and I want to pay it"? Who would say that the probate court in any State of this country would refuse to order that the bill be paid if that were the proper procedure to follow in his particular jurisdiction? Yet that is precisely what is occurring in all these cases that I have brought to your attention, cases in which not only the claimant asserts the justice of the claim and furnishes proof overwhelming, but where the Government, through the department where the claim arose, admits the justice of the claim but can not pay it for lack of authority in law.

WHAT WILL BE GAINED?

Now what would be gained by the plan that I propose?

First. There would be a speedy adjustment of claims against the Government.

Second. Fictitious claims would be turned down and would not come in hoary with age as their chief measure of merit.

Third. There would be orderly procedure.

Fourth. The claims would be disposed of by the department having the facts before it.

Fifth. Claims that should be disposed of by one competent department head and that in civil procedure are disposed of by justices of the peace would not need to challenge and engross the attention not of one Member of Congress and not of one committee but of 435 busy Members of the House and 96 Senators as well as the attention of the department where the claim arose, and finally the President.

Sixth. The Senators and Representatives would have more time for the large and important legislative problems.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. OVERSTREET].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, just 12 years ago to-day I had the honor and privilege of addressing the Fifty-ninth Congress on the merits of the general Agricultural appropriation bill, which was then up for consideration. I had been elected to fill out the unexpired term caused by the death of Hon. Rufus E. Lester, and this was my first appearance before this body of American legislators. I had occasion then to criticize Congress for the parsimonious policy adopted by our Government toward the great agricultural classes. The bill under discussion carried an appropriation of only \$9,000,000. This bill carries an appropriation of \$31,000,000, to be wisely and judiciously expended for the promotion of the interests of the American farmer, and I desire to congratulate the country upon the fact that we have at last come to regard agriculture in the proper light—the foundation stone upon which rests all

our material greatness. I shall be glad to support this bill, and I hope there will be no material changes in it when it finally passes the House.

But, Mr. Chairman, I desire to make some observations on a different line. I had hoped that it would not become necessary for me to make these remarks, but I have patiently waited for some other Member on our side of the House to answer the charges that I shall undertake to answer, but thus far no one has come forward to make a reply. I much preferred that some Member longer in the service would perform the duty that I shall endeavor to perform.

At the outset I desire to state that I hold no brief for the President nor his administration. I am not the authorized spokesman for the National Democratic Party. I do not pretend to represent the views of a majority of the Members on my side of the House, but I am the Representative of my district and have a right to speak for them.

The Republican Party has controlled this Government so long that they feel that they have a right and title to it by prescription. They seem to look upon the Democratic Party as mere trespassers without even a color of title to the offices from the President down. The people of this country may well congratulate themselves upon the fact that President Wilson has occupied the White House during the past six years, the most memorable and exciting in our country's history. There seems to have been an effort on the part of the Republican Party to weaken his influence from the beginning of his first presidential term. No President of this country has ever had to deal with as many grave and complicated questions as President Wilson has had to meet and dispose of. For weeks and weeks I have sat silent in my seat, expecting some Member on this side of the House to defend him and his administration against certain charges. It seems to me that some of the leaders on the other side have endeavored to block and thwart the purposes of the President in a great many instances. They have tried to amend a number of important war measures in order to take from the President some of the power and authority carried in the bills. This, of course, would have emasculated the bills, and those Members attempting to pass these amendments knew it at that time. I refer especially to the Food Administration bill, where it was attempted to pass an amendment creating a commission of three to perform the work and duties that have been so admirably performed by Mr. Hoover.

Another instance is where it was attempted to create a commission practically to carry on the war and to take out of the hands of the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the power and authority lodged in him by the Constitution of the United States.

In the President's last address before Congress, just before his departure for Europe, you endeavored to embarrass him. In the course of his speech, when he made the statement that he himself proposed to attend the peace conference, our side of the House arose en masse and applauded him, but you remained in your seats like statues of stone to show to him and to testify to the world in no uncertain manner your disapproval of his course.

It seems to me that there has not been that full cooperation that should have existed, especially when this country has been engaged in war. And yet I have recently heard prominent Members on the other side of the House charge that if an extra session of Congress should become necessary the Democratic side of the House was responsible for it. Why should we want an extra session of Congress? We know that the President desires and the country desires that all the appropriation bills should be passed before the 4th of March, and we are making every effort in our power to have these bills passed before that time; but, as I have already stated, Members on the other side have had the temerity, and even the effrontery, to charge this side of the House with an effort to delay the passage of these important measures.

Why should we desire an extra session of Congress? Would we prefer a Republican Speaker to a Democratic Speaker? Would we prefer a Republican majority to a Democratic majority? Would we prefer to see the offices appertaining to this House, from the Clerk down to the smallest paid employee, filled by persons of the opposite political faith? To ask these questions answers them. We are not in favor of an extra session, and we hope that an extra session may not be necessary.

Not only have the Members of this House and others holding public office attempted to annoy the President and embarrass his administration, but citizens in private life who have enjoyed the highest office in the gift of the American people have contributed their portion toward making the road thorny for the President to travel.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Will not the gentleman yield?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I would be glad if my friend would specify the things in which the President has been hampered by this side of the House. The gentleman makes a general charge. Let him state specific measures.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I can not attempt to enumerate all the measures, but particularly do I mention the Food Administration bill. When this bill came up for a vote, the Republicans sought to amend it by creating a commission, and thus take from the President the power and authority mentioned in the bill of designating some one to act for him, and it is well known to everybody that should this bill pass Mr. Hoover would be nominated as the Food Administrator. And there are other measures, but I can not take the time to enumerate them.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman states that all of us undertook to create a food commission.

Mr. OVERSTREET. No; I did not say all of you.

Mr. HAUGEN. I desire to say that the members of the committee worked hand in hand, the Republican members with the Democratic members of that committee, and we aided in every way that we possibly could, and that the suggestions which were adopted came from the Republicans as much as they did from the Democrats, and met with the approval of the administration.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Georgia will permit me, I have not a moment's further time to yield him, and he is allowing his time to be consumed by others.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has five minutes.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I am sorry, gentlemen, but I can not yield any more. Now, what is true, some of you have voted for these measures, because you knew your constituents would defeat you for reelection if you did not support them. Some of you, I am persuaded, voted for them grudgingly, but you felt compelled to vote as you did, because you represented the views of your constituents.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say this—

Mr. OVERSTREET. I can not yield any more, as I have but a few minutes left. Mr. Chairman, up to a few weeks ago the greatest representative the Republican Party ever had, living or dead, contributed weekly to the Kansas City Star editorials that were calculated to embarrass the President in his conduct of the war and in his great undertaking to unite and organize the peoples of the earth into a league of nations to prevent the recurrence of future wars.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

Mr. HAUGEN. I do not want to take the gentleman's time, but I know he wants to be fair—

Mr. OVERSTREET. All I ask is just to let me finish the sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Georgia are out of order, and the gentleman from Missouri has made the point of no quorum.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, as one Member of this House, I do not intend to sit here while insults are being heaped upon a distinguished citizen—

Mr. OVERSTREET. I ask that the gentleman permit me to conclude the sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri must either make or withdraw his point of no quorum.

Mr. DYER. If the gentleman from Georgia will refrain from attacking ex-President Roosevelt and the Members on this side, I will not insist upon a point of order.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I assure the gentleman that he can find no fault with my statement if the House will permit me to complete the sentence. I said the greatest representative of the Republican Party ever had, living or dead, up to a few weeks ago, contributed weekly to the Kansas City Star articles that were calculated to embarrass the President in the prosecution of the war and his great undertaking to unite and organize the peoples of the earth into a league of nations to prevent the recurrence of future wars, and I want it clearly and distinctly understood that I am not attempting to minimize one particle the wonderful achievements of the great ex-President, and far be it from my purpose to reflect in the slightest upon the character or memory of the illustrious dead; but I feel it is my duty to call the attention of this House to every human agency or instrumentality that has been at work during the past six years to weaken or diminish the influence and power of President Wilson in the estimation of the people, both at home and abroad.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute more to the gentleman, for I know he wants to be fair. The gentleman has charged this side of the House with cowardice.

Mr. OVERSTREET. No, I have not.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman said that we did not dare to vote otherwise than for these bills, because we were afraid we would be defeated in the election. The question has been submitted to the American people and the returns would indicate that the position taken by the gentleman is not well taken.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes; you went before the people for reelection, and in Kansas and in Nebraska and in the other western States you told the people that the Democratic Party had acted unfairly, that they had fixed the price of wheat and refused to fix the price of cotton. In the New England and Northern States you said the South was in the saddle. Your majority was won by making appeals to the passions and prejudices of the people by declaring that the South was in the saddle and controlled and dominated the national democratic administration. Now, recently the National Republican Committee met in Chicago to lay their plans for the next presidential election, and, judging from an account of the proceedings of this committee, the South will be your chief target of attack. The poisoned missiles of your misrepresentation and abuse will be aimed at—in the language of a member of that committee—"one corner of the country," a reference to the South made contemptuously by Gov. Harding, of Iowa. I hold in my hand a copy of an article from the Washington Post, dated January 11, the day after this National Republican Committee met, and it seems that the burden of their song was to criticize and malign the South. Gov. Beeckman, of Rhode Island, a member of the committee, said that the people of the North were tired of paying 90 per cent of the taxes and having it expended by a minority of the South, which dominated the national democratic administration; and Gov. Harding, of Iowa, said that this is too big and too great a country to be ruled by one corner of it.

Now, gentlemen, I submit that I am disappointed at the membership of the Republican National Committee. I would have thought that that committee would be composed of broad-minded statesmen who are too big to cast any slurs upon the South, especially since it has been more than 50 years since the great Civil War, which left the South naked and destitute. But I am glad to say, Mr. Chairman, that she has recovered from that destitution and nakedness, and such a recuperation the world has never seen before and I doubt if it ever will again.

In the beautiful words of Senator JAMES HAMILTON LEWIS, from an article recently appearing in the Washington Post:

Yet this South paid her share of the Government debts, bore her burdens, sent her boys to die in the Spanish-American War—from San Juan to Santiago in Cuba, from Manila to Zamboanga in the Philippines. She sent her boys to France, cheering for the flag of the Union, and for America they died and sleep in unmarked mounds in France in every vale and riverside, from the English Channel to the Rhine. Who is there to say of these people that because once or twice in 50 years their northern and western brethren granted them some of the places of honor in the Government they should be the objects of national political party vengeance?

What we need, Mr. Chairman, is broad-minded patriotism; sectional feeling and prejudice should be cast aside. What we now want is confidence in the wisdom of our delegates at the peace conference in France to give to the world a lasting peace—confidence in the parties to the contract, confidence in our great Government at Washington, and confidence in the President of the United States, confidence in each other and ourselves. Do not rock the boat but "stand by" your great captain, who will steer the old ship of state into a haven of safety at last.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, all I care to say is this: The question was submitted to the American people, and if the gentleman is satisfied with the results we certainly are, for we have no complaint to make.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, briefly, along the line that I talked about.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to inquire of the gentleman from Iowa if he has anyone present ready to go on.

Mr. HAUGEN. I have used more time than the gentleman from South Carolina has, and it was understood that we would rise after the gentleman finished.

Mr. LEVER. May I inquire how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has 60 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Iowa 53 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I thought there was a distinct agreement that general debate should proceed until 9 o'clock, with the provision that one hour should then be used to-morrow at such time as the House resolved itself into the committee again for the consideration of this bill. That was my understanding.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is not quite right about that. The understanding was that we would proceed for three hours, at which time the committee would rise, and that we would then give way to the Appropriations Committee to bring up a deficiency appropriation bill to-morrow, which would leave us still one hour of general debate. Certain gentlemen to whom I have promised time are unavoidably absent. That is true also with respect to the gentleman from Iowa. While they ought to be here, yet they are not here, and I do not want to shut them out, because I understand the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is not going to have any general debate at all upon his bill, other than his own opening statement. It is just a matter of trying to keep good faith with these men.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I thought there was a very distinct understanding on the part of the Members of the House that the general debate should proceed for three hours.

Mr. LEVER. That is true; but the gentleman recognizes this fact—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. This is going to delay the passage of the appropriation bill further.

Mr. LEVER. That is true.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course, I can not prevent the gentleman from making a motion to rise, but I shall vote against it. I have remained here, as have many others, with the understanding that what I state was agreed to. There could not possibly be a misunderstanding.

Mr. STAFFORD. There was no agreement. It was merely an assertion on the part of the chairman that he would make that effort.

Mr. HAUGEN. Objection was made against that agreement.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. We innocent bystanders always believe in the statements made by the chairman and the ranking Members, and we have remained here. I would have gone long ago if it had not been for that understanding.

Mr. LEVER. We have consumed two hours and 20 minutes, and it will make a difference of about 40 minutes. If it is necessary, of course, I can send for these Members.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Why not go on with the debate now?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will withhold that for a moment—

Mr. STAFFORD. Very well.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I made very diligent effort to reach a member of my committee, to whom I had allotted 15 minutes of time. I happen to know that the gentleman left the hall believing that he would be able to take his time when we met again, and I know that the gentleman is not very well. I have not been able to locate him, so that we have run out of soap just now, and I do not feel, in justice to these gentlemen, who think they are going to have time, that they should be denied the opportunity all for the sake of saving 40 minutes in debate.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield? The agreement or the statement was made with a full membership, or as nearly a full membership as we ever have present.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I recognize—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Who is to speak?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. LEVER) there were—ayes 9, noes 1.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15018, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee report from the Pension Bureau, appearing in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, be printed as a House document and that a short letter from the Commissioner of Pensions, read to-day from the Clerk's desk, be printed as a preface to the document.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Texas if he has taken up this matter with the chairman of the Committee on Printing [Mr. BARNHART]?

Mr. BLANTON. No; but I will state for the benefit of the gentleman from South Carolina that this is a report of a special committee of experts from the Pension Office appointed by Commissioner Saltzgaber a short while ago to report on the various companies of Indian fighters in Texas, as to which of them are entitled to the benefits of the act of March 4, 1917, and which are not. It will save a great deal of correspondence for the 18 Members of Congress from Texas in answering inquiries—

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I think I recall this matter was before the House before, and I suggest to the gentleman from Texas that he defer his request until the chairman of the Committee on Printing is present.

Mr. BLANTON. The chairman of the Committee on Printing has made no objection to it.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit, there was some gentleman who objected to this same request this morning.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts.

Mr. HAMLIN. Does he consent now?

Mr. BLANTON. I do not know; he is not present.

Mr. HAMLIN. Well, I think it would hardly be fair to take it up to-night—

Mr. LEVER. I object, Mr. Speaker, for the time being, and I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas had it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, on that question I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays. One gentleman has arisen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will withhold for a moment—

Mr. BLANTON. I will withhold for a moment.

Mr. LEVER. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a question of order. It does not require a quorum to adjourn.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order it does not require a quorum to adjourn.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for a division on the vote to adjourn.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order it is too late; the gentleman has already demanded the yeas and nays and the yeas and nays have been refused.

Mr. BLANTON. A decision has not been made by the Chair, and I ask for a division on the question to adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Division is demanded. The question is, Shall the House now adjourn?

The House divided; and there were—ayes 13, noes 1.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum. The SPEAKER pro tempore. It does not require a quorum to adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT.

So the motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Tuesday, January 28, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of New Buffalo Harbor, Mich. (H. Doc. No. 1730); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of War, chairman of the committee of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater Commission, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the care and maintenance of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, Arlington National Cemetery, Va., fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 1731); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, chairman of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater Commission, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required to supply a deficiency in the original appropriation for the construction of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, in Arlington National Cemetery, Va. (H. Doc. No. 1732); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Geological Survey for the continuation of the collection of coal and coke production and distribution statistics for the report of the mineral resources of the United States for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 1733); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Engineer Department for flood control of the Mississippi River, in addition to the sum heretofore estimated for (H. Doc. No. 1734); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of War, submitting supplementary report of the claims determined to January 24 by the board appointed to consider, ascertain, and determine the amounts due on all claims for damages and loss to private property occasioned by the explosion at the plant of the T. A. Gillespie Loading Co., at Morgan, N. J. (H. Doc. No. 1735); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12352) for the retirement of employees in the classified service, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 988), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CARAWAY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 208) providing that one term of the United States District Court for the Eastern Judicial District of Oklahoma shall be held annually at Hugo, Okla., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 990), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SLAYDEN, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13482) creating a commission for the maintenance, control, care, etc., of the Perry's Victory Memorial on Put in Bay Island, Lake Erie, Ohio, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 991), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ALMON, from the Committee on Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14497) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, by increasing the maximum of Federal aid in the construction of roads to \$15,000 per mile, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 992), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAYS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 4103) to consolidate certain forest lands within the Cache National Forest, Utah, and to add certain lands thereto, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 993), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 4244) for the relief of entrymen within the Castle Peak irrigation project, Utah, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 994), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 2088) to consolidate certain forest lands within the Cache National Forest, Utah, and to add certain lands thereto, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 995), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BEAKES, from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13878) granting a franking privilege to Edith Carow Roosevelt, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 996), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 15140) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 15141) to prohibit the payment of compensation to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress and other officers and employees under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 15142) to provide for the incorporation of certain companies engaged in foreign trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLASSON: A bill (H. R. 15143) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Oconto, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ADOLPHUS P. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 15144) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Park Falls, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 15145) providing for the employment by the United States Government of soldiers and sailors of the United States and prescribing the preference to be extended them in filling clerical and other vacancies; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. OLIVER of New York: A bill (H. R. 15146) to authorize and empower the Postmaster General to construct, maintain, and operate a mail tunnel in the city of New York; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 15147) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Shawnee, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 15148) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Olathe, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15149) to provide for the erection of a public building at Paola, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 15150) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Smithtown Branch, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15151) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Sea Cliff, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 15152) to provide for extra pay when discharged for officers and enlisted men who were in the Army of the United States when war was declared against Germany or have since entered the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 15153) to provide for a site and Government building at Council Grove, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15154) for the enlargement of the Federal building at Erie, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15155) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Girard, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 15156) to enlarge and extend the post-office building at Logansport, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15157) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hartford City, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 15158) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the city of Ansonia, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15159) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the town of Winsted, Conn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15160) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the town of Salisbury, Conn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15161) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the town of Torrington, Conn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15162) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the city of Waterbury, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 15163) to acquire a site and erect a building thereon at Springfield, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 15164) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15165) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Newcastle, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 15166) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Marysville, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15167) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Petaluma, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 15168) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Sand Lake, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 15169) to establish a zoological park in the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 15170) to donate two cannons of obsolete pattern to the city of Staples, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 15171) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Menomonie, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15172) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hudson, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15173) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eau Claire, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15174) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rice Lake, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15175) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chippewa Falls, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 15176) to provide for the erection of a public building at Nashville, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15177) to provide for the erection of a public building at De Queen, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 15178) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Madill, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15179) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Wilburton, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15180) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Hugo, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15181) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Idabel, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15182) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Antlers, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15183) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Marietta, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15184) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Poteau, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15185) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Atoka, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 15186) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the repairing and enlargement of a Federal building thereon at Okmulgee, Okla., or to authorize the acqui-

sition of a site and the erection of a Federal building thereon at Okmulgee, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 15187) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Tarentum, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 15188) requiring The Adjutant General of the United States Army and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain data to the adjutants general of the several States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 15189) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Wynne, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAMSEY: A bill (H. R. 15190) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of East Rutherford, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 15191) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Aspinwall, Pittsburgh, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15192) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Etana, Pittsburgh, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15193) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Bellevue, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15194) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Fineview district of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 15195) authorizing the acquisition of a site for a public building at Island Pond, Vt.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15196) authorizing the acquisition of a site for a post-office building at Bellows Falls, Vt.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 15197) for the erection of a public building at Sulphur Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15198) for the erection of a public building at Decatur, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15199) for the erection of a public building at Gentry, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 15200) for the erection of a public building at Conway, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15201) for the erection of a public building at Morrilton, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15202) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Little Rock, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GARLAND: A bill (H. R. 15203) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Mooseheart, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15204) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Charleroi, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROWLAND: A bill (H. R. 15205) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Phillipsburg, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALTON: A bill (H. R. 15206) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the New Mexico Military Institute, at Roswell, N. Mex., German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 15207) granting the consent of Congress to the Fall Branch Coal Co. to construct a bridge across Tug River, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 15208) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Strong, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15209) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cottonwood Falls, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 15210) to authorize the Judge Advocate of the United States Army to classify the soldiers of the American Expeditionary Forces who have been court-martialed and return to those who were fined for misde-

meanors the amount of fine collected therefrom; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHN M. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 15211) to increase the limit of cost for the proposed new Federal building at Madison, Wis., and the site thereof; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 15212) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WELLING: A bill (H. R. 15213) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Spanish Fork, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15214) for the construction of a Federal building at Nephi, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15215) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Park City, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15216) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Eureka, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15217) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Vernal, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: A bill (H. R. 15218) to authorize the erection of a Federal building at Jamestown, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Building and Grounds.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 15219) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15220) providing for a site and public building for post office and other Federal purposes at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 15221) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the city of Wooster, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15222) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the city of Dover, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15223) to donate a captured cannon or gun to Ragersville, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15224) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the city of Dennison, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 15225) to provide for the enlargement, extension, and remodeling of the Federal building at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 15233) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lee, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15234) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Stockbridge, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15235) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Charlemont, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALTON: Resolution (H. Res. 522) providing increased compensation to the official stenographers to committees; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. TILLMAN: Resolution (H. Res. 523) declaring T. A. Chandler a duly elected Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Elections No. 2.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Resolution (H. Res. 524) directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House of Representatives certain information regarding investigation of complaint made by E. L. Rice; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Resolution (H. Res. 525) to initiate the necessary steps to open opportunities for employment to all workers in the United States who face enforced idleness; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ALMON: Resolution (H. Res. 526) providing for printing additional copies of soil survey of Lauderdale County, Ala.; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. PAIGE: Resolution (H. Res. 527) directing the Clerk of the House to post conspicuously in the House wing of the Capitol and in the House Office Building notices of committee hearings in advance thereof; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 528) providing for pay for examiner detailed to the Committee on Invalid Pensions from the Bureau of Pensions; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: Resolution (H. Res. 529) to initiate the necessary steps to open opportunities for employment to all workers in the United States who face enforced idleness; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 530) providing for an investigation of the treatment of sick and disabled soldiers at the Walter Reed Hospital, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 5234, war minerals bill; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon praying that loganberry and apple juices be exempted from taxation in the pending revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 5234, war minerals bill; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 15226) granting an increase of pension to James K. Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 15227) granting a pension to Amelia Erdman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 15228) granting a pension to Charles Dolderer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15229) granting a pension to Starling N. Caron; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 15230) granting a pension to Henry Fields; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15231) granting a pension to Lee Begley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 15232) granting a pension to Frances E. Herlehy; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Un-a-quaw-ian Society, calling for Indian representation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against and asking for repeal of postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Fur Workers' Union, Local No. 77, protesting against the proposed tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Sindorf & Stein, Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against luxury tax provision levying 10 per cent tax on hats, shirts, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: Petition of Frederick W. Miller, East South Illinois Street, Corry, Pa., demanding repeal of postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Ajax Iron Works, Corry, Pa., urging repeal of postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Memorial of city council of Cambridge, favoring the proposal to give men discharged from service an amount equal to six months' pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Massachusetts, urging repeal of the postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of La Crosse Printing Pressmen's Union, No. 189, protesting against postal zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLET: Petition of Native Races' Anti-Liquor Traffic Committee of New York City, favoring destruction of opium now held in China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GLYNN: Petition of certain citizens of Salisbury, Conn., protesting against the increase in postage on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Friends of Irish Freedom of Terryville, Conn., in favor of the principle of self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Petition of Mary E. Smith, Mildred E. Gould, Emma Owen, and Daisy Bergman, urging repeal of the postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of South Haven, Mich., urging repeal of the postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of members of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Cloverdale, Mich., urging repeal of postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of George P. Hamner and 16 other citizens of Steubenville, Ohio, protesting against postal zone system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Miss Mabel E. Anderson and others, of Cadiz, Ohio, rural route 3, protesting against zone system of postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of certain residents of Hartford, Conn., relative to postal-zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of Minnehaha Lodge, No. 827, International Association of Machinists, Minneapolis, Minn., requesting a congressional investigation of the policies of Postmaster General as to labor conditions in the telegraph and telephone service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Northwestern Lumbermen's Association, of Minneapolis, opposing Government ownership of railroads and declaring for Federal control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Petition of Cattlemen's Association, Douglas County, Oreg., on disposition of Oregon & California Railway Co. land grants; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Philadelphia Board of Trade, relating to inland transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEELY: Petition of J. W. Williams, manager Williams Hardware Co., Clarksburg, W. Va., urging that new taxation bill shall be held at \$4,000,000,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. W. Patton, secretary Northern West Virginia Coal Operator's Association, Fairmont, W. Va., urging that the new taxation bill be kept at \$4,000,000,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLK: Petition of members of State Board of Education of Delaware, urging full support in passage of Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Joseph W. F. Quin and others, favoring House bill 10550; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, Chicago, Ill., protesting against their treatment by United States Telegraph and Telephone Administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mrs. A. N. Wilson, Doyle, Cal., urging repeal of postal zone system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., protesting against war tax on letter mail and retention of zone second-class rates on advertising matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. H. Gross, president Universal Military Training League, Chicago, Ill., urging bill for universal training for boys between ages of 18 and 20 years; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of School Woman's Club of Alameda, Cal., indorsing Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of certain citizens of Nevada County, Cal., demanding the repeal of postal zone-rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of California Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Association, requesting Congress to pass Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petitions of citizens of North Branch, Valley Springs, and San Andreas, Cal., urging repeal of postal zone system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of Nonpartisan League Local of Dalton, Otertail County, Minn., relative to House bill 13900, motto on coins; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 28, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, father of our spirits, the source of our freedom, the defender of our liberties, we come before Thee to ask Thy guidance and blessing as we seek to maintain the precious inheritance that has been passed to us from our fathers and to advance the interests of Thy kingdom. We pray that we may have the satisfaction of knowing that we are God's chosen men, directed in paths to the fulfillment of God's great purpose in us

as a Nation. To this end do Thou endue us plentifully with heavenly wisdom, and give us Thy guidance and blessing for the duties of this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

GERMAN PROPAGANDA—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to a matter in the nature of a question of personal privilege. This morning there appeared in the Washington Post a statement by the Secretary of War. I will ask the Secretary to read the headlines and the first two paragraphs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

REPUTED BY BAKER.—A STEVENSON'S "PACIFIST" LIST DENOUNCED BY SECRETARY.—NOT WITH WAR DEPARTMENT.—SENATE WITNESS CONNECTED WITH NEW YORK INTELLIGENCE BUREAU.—"GERMAN PROPAGANDA" LIST, SAYS SECRETARY, CONTAINS NAMES OF PEOPLE OF DISTINCTION AND UNQUESTIONED LOYALTY.—DISCLAIMED ALSO BY STATE DEPARTMENT.—MANY TELEGRAMS OF PROTEST.

[By Albert W. Fox.]

The investigation which the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary is conducting of pro-German propaganda took on a new aspect yesterday when Secretary of War Baker came boldly to the defense of some of the so-called pacifists whose names were contained on a list prepared by Archibald Stevenson, understood to be representing the military intelligence department. Mr. Baker denounced the list and repudiated the suggestion that Mr. Stevenson represented any branch of the War Department. He issued the following statement:

"I am receiving telegrams and letters with regard to a list of persons handed to the Senate committee by Mr. Archibald Stevenson, who is represented in newspaper accounts as a member of the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department. Mr. Stevenson has never been an officer or an employee of the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department."

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, in answer to that, I ask the Secretary to read the statement I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

"I assume the Secretary of War in his statement published in the press this morning did not intend to criticize the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, charged with the investigation of German propaganda. Whether he approves of the method adopted by the committee or not is a matter of no concern to the committee. But when he undertakes to repudiate and escape responsibility for a witness called by that committee at the instance of one of the branches of the War Department his statement can not be permitted to go unchallenged."

"The facts are these: Secretary Baker declares that 'Mr. Stevenson has never been an officer or an employee of the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department.'"

"This committee never heard of Mr. Stevenson until his name was called to the attention of the committee in a communication from the office of Military Intelligence, War Department, New York City, dated December 17, 1918, addressed to the Director of Military Intelligence, Washington, D. C., which communication, with a notation to rush, was delivered by the office of the Director of Military Intelligence, Washington, D. C., to this committee, and the portion thereof relating to Mr. Stevenson reads as follows:

"WAR DEPARTMENT,
"OFFICE OF MILITARY INTELLIGENCE,
"ROOM NO. 806, 302 BROADWAY,
"New York City, December 17, 1918."

"From: Office M. I. D., 302 Broadway, New York.
"To: Director of Military Intelligence, Washington, D. C.
"Subject: Senate inquiry."

"1. It is respectfully suggested that the following witnesses be called to testify before the Senate inquiry:

"Archibald Ewing Stevenson, of the propaganda section, who has studied German propaganda in the United States for over a year and concentrated on the subject, and is probably more familiar with the various interlocking groups of German and radical propagandists in the United States at this time than anyone else."

"JOHN B. TRAVOR,
"Captain, U. S. A."

"It is evident that the Secretary of War did not familiarize himself with the employees of his department or the work which was being done by the Bureau of Military Intelligence."

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand the original letter that came to the committee, signed by Capt. Travor. Senators will notice this pink slip of paper inscribed "Rush." The letter was rushed to the committee, calling our attention to this man Stevenson, asserting that he had been in the department for a year studying German propaganda and was the man who should be brought before our committee. With that pink slip there was another slip of a different color—I do not know why they use different colors—also containing the inscription "Rush." It was rushed to me, and after getting this letter, as I have set forth in the statement read by the Secretary, I